



CONGRESSIONAL QUARTERLY
Weekly Report

REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED IN WHOLE OR IN PART

VOL. XIV
PAGES 1207-1234

WEEK ENDING OCT. 12, 1956

No. 41

CONTENTS

| | <u>Page</u> |
|-----------------------|-------------|
| Congressional Quiz | ii |
| Fact Sheets | 1207 |
| Pressures On Congress | 1216 |
| Around The Capitol | 1218 |
| Committee Roundup | 1219 |
| Political Notes | 1223 |
| Campaign Statements | 1224 |
| Capitol Quotes | iii |
| Week In Congress | iv |

Battle for the Senate

Page 1207

LOBBIES WANT CO-OP TAX LAWS REVISED

Page 1213

Committee Probes

Illinois Bank Scandal.....Page 1219

Natural Gas Lobbying.....Page 1220

Campaign Contributions.....Page 1221

COPYRIGHT 1956

BY CONGRESSIONAL QUARTERLY NEWS FEATURES

The Authoritative Reference on Congress

1156 NINETEENTH STREET, N. W. • WASHINGTON 6, D. C. • STerling 3-8060

Congressional Quiz

With campaign assertions and counter-assertions flying, are you having trouble keeping the record straight? Test your memory on this quiz. Try for 5 out of 7.

1. Q--A candidate recently predicted "the time not too far distant when we can have a four-day week." Who said it? (one point)

A--Richard M. Nixon, Republican Vice Presidential candidate, in a Sept. 22 speech at Colorado Springs, Colo. Nixon said his party's goal was "a new way of life" in which "back-breaking toil and mind-wearying tension will be left to machines and electronic devices."



2. Q--From the Democratic side came a charge that a prominent Republican's brother had a hand in formulating U.S. policy which built up Argentine Dictator Juan Peron. Who was the subject of the charge: (a) President Eisenhower's brother Milton; (b) John Foster Dulles' brother Allen; (c) the late Sen. Robert A. Taft's brother Charles. (one point)

A--(a) Milton Eisenhower.

3. Q--Democratic Presidential Candidate Adlai E. Stevenson Oct. 1 outlined a program of federal aid to education which included all but one of the following elements. Which one was omitted: (a) funds to hire more teachers; (b) aid for school

construction; (c) federally supported scholarships and fellowships; (d) federal aid to be given states on a 50-50 matching basis?

A--(d). Stevenson said his "present thinking" was that at least part of the federal aid program should be on a nonmatching basis.

4. Q--True or false: Both major parties failed to mention the 1954 Supreme Court decision on school segregation in the civil rights planks of their platforms. (one point)

A--False. Although the Democratic platform did not mention the decision, the Republican platform said the GOP "accepts" it. Neither party specifically endorsed the decision, however.

5. Q--Who said, "I like a man who, when anything goes wrong in government cleans up fast," and of whom was he speaking? (two points)

A--President Eisenhower said it Sept. 25 in Peoria, Ill., of Gov. William C. Stratton (R) whose State Auditor, Orville E. Hodge, recently was jailed for misusing state funds.

6. Q--Rep. Thomas J. Lane (D Mass.) Sept. 18 won renomination over four rival candidates for a ninth term from Massachusetts' Seventh District. Should Lane win the election in his heavily Democratic district, what distinction would he have? (one point)

A--He would be the first person to be elected to Congress after serving a prison term. Lane was recently released from federal prison after serving four months for income tax evasion.

Copyright 1956, by Congressional Quarterly News Features
1156 Nineteenth Street, N.W., Washington 6, D.C.

CQ WEEKLY REPORT is published every Friday. All reproduction rights, including quotation, broadcasting and publication, are reserved for current editorial clients only. Second rights are reserved, including use of Congressional Quarterly material in campaign supplements, advertisements and handbooks without special permission. Rates are based on membership and/or circulation of clients and will be furnished on request. CQ Weekly Report and index also are available to clients on microfilm, at \$5.10 a year. Second class mail privileges authorized at Washington, District of Columbia.



DEMOCRATS MOST LIKELY TO CONTROL SENATE

When the Senate reassembles Jan. 3, which party will have the votes to organize it? The answer, as the campaign enters its final stages: The Democrats, most likely.

That is the conclusion of Congressional Quarterly's roundup of the 35 Senate races to be decided Nov. 6, based on off-the-record interviews with political experts, candidates and national convention delegates of both parties, supplemented by reports from the various states.

In its last Senate survey, completed just before the August conventions, CQ reported, "the Republican party has about a 50-50 chance to recapture Senate control." (That survey, giving important background for the present study, is found in Weekly Report, p. 957)

Two months later, the odds seem to be against Republican success.

Of the 96 Senate seats (49 held by Democrats and 47 by Republicans in the 84th Congress), 35 will be filled Nov. 6. The remaining 61 are held by 31 Democrats and 30 Republicans.

The Nov. 6 contests shape up this way:

- **SAFE REPUBLICAN (3)** -- Kansas, New Hampshire, Vermont.
- **SAFE DEMOCRATIC (10)** -- Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina (2).
- **LEANING REPUBLICAN (10)** -- California, Colorado, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, Wisconsin.
- **LEANING DEMOCRATIC (6)** -- Kentucky (1), Missouri, Nevada, Pennsylvania, Washington, West Virginia.
- **DOUBTFUL HELD BY REPUBLICANS (3)** -- Connecticut, Maryland, Ohio.
- **DOUBTFUL HELD BY DEMOCRATS (3)** -- Kentucky, (1), New York, Oregon.

Thus, Democrats seem assured of at least 41 seats when the 85th Congress convenes (31 incumbents plus 10 safe seats), while Republicans can count on a minimum of only 33 (30 incumbents plus three safe seats). For a clear majority, Republicans would have to win 16 of the 22 remaining contests. The survey rates Republican candidates ahead in only 10 of these races, with the parties even in six others and the Democrats leading in the other six. The odds, then, would seem to be against Republican victory.

(Another Senate seat, now held by Price Daniel (D Texas), will be vacated by Jan. 15, 1957, when Daniel becomes governor of Texas. The manner and time of filling this prospective vacancy have not been determined but Daniel probably will be in the Senate himself Jan. 3 to vote on organization.)

Since CQ's August survey the odds have shifted in at least eight races. Six of the eight changes favor the Democrats.

ARIZONA -- Sen. Carl Hayden (D), who will be dean of the Senate if re-elected, received twice as many votes

as the combined total for candidates in the Republican primary Sept. 11. His race against Ross F. Jones (R), former state attorney general, once considered Leaning Democratic, now seems Safe Democratic.

CONNECTICUT -- The contest between Sen. Prescott Bush (R) and Rep. Thomas J. Dodd (D), once considered Leaning Republican, has moved into the Doubtful category because of Dodd's strong campaigning, questions as to the size of President Eisenhower's likely plurality in the state.

NEVADA -- The once-muddled Democratic primary situation produced a strong endorsement for Sen. Alan Bible (D) in his race against Rep. Clifton Young (R). Once Doubtful, this contest now seems to be Leaning Democratic.

PENNSYLVANIA -- Formerly in the Doubtful category, this state now is the only one where the odds seem against re-election of the incumbent. Big Democratic registration gains plus Republican intramural quarrels, give hard-campaigning Joseph S. Clark Jr. (D) the edge on Sen. James H. Duff (R). Leaning Democratic.

SOUTH DAKOTA -- Talk of farm discontent plus unexpectedly vigorous Democratic campaigning in this traditionally Republican state move the Senate contest from the Safe Republican to the Leaning Republican category. Sen. Francis Case (R) still has a sizeable lead on Kenneth Holm (D).

WASHINGTON -- Sen. Warren Magnuson (D) garnered 150,000 more votes than Gov. Arthur B. Langlie in their respective "popularity primaries," switching this race from Doubtful to Leaning Democratic.

Two of the changes favor the Republicans:

COLORADO -- Democrats nominated two-time-loser John A. Carroll to run against popular ex-Gov. Dan Thornton (R), moving the race from the Doubtful to the Leaning Republican category.

OHIO -- Growing Republican organization effort plus indefatigable campaigning have improved Sen. George H. Bender's (R) chances against the Democrats' vote-getting phenomenon, five-term Gov. Frank J. Lausche. The consensus calls this one Doubtful, rather than Leaning Democratic as it was two months ago.

Ten races seem safe for the Democratic nominees and three seem certain to go Republican.

Safe Democratic: Alabama, Sen. Lister Hill (D) unopposed; Arizona, Sen. Carl Hayden (D) vs. Ross F. Jones (R); Arkansas, Sen. J.W. Fulbright (D) vs. Ben C. Henley (R); Florida, Sen. George A. Smathers (D) unopposed; Georgia, Herman Talmadge (D) unopposed; Louisiana, Sen. Russell B. Long (D) unopposed; North Carolina, Sen. Sam J. Ervin (D) vs. Joel A. Johnson (R); Oklahoma, Sen. A.S. Mike Monroney (D) vs. Douglas McKeever (R); South Carolina, Sen. Olin D. Johnston (D) vs. Leon T. Crawford (R) and Strom Thurmond (D) unopposed.

Safe Republican: Kansas, Sen. Frank Carlson (R) vs. George Hart; New Hampshire, Sen. Norris Cotton (R) vs.

Senate Outlook - 2

Laurence M. Pickett (D); Vermont, Sen. George D. Aiken (R) vs. Bernard G. O'Shea (D).

Here is a state by state roundup of undecided races:

California

Sen. Thomas H. Kuchel (R), appointed and then elected (in 1954 with 53.2 percent of the vote) to fill out the Senate term of Vice President Richard M. Nixon, seeks a full six-year term. He is opposed by State Sen. Richard Richards (D) of Los Angeles, making his first statewide race. Kuchel, an Eisenhower supporter who has worked diligently on projects of interest to his state, is rated a somewhat colorless campaigner. Richards, less well known than his opponent outside Los Angeles, is a better stump speaker and television performer.

Issues: National issues are dominant, with both candidates staying close to their parties' platforms.

Outlook: The Democratic organization has showed strongly in the campaign thus far and the Democrats' registration edge tops 800,000. Kuchel, however, drew 450,000 votes in the June Democratic primary, indicating substantial Democratic support. Richards, a foe of the cross-filing system, did not enter the Republican primary. Kuchel has stayed clear of Republican factional fights, Democrats concede his record in Washington leaves little room for attack. The race may turn on the Presidential vote. Mr. Eisenhower won 56.4 percent of the vote in 1952 but Democrats claim Nixon, a controversial figure in his home state, will cost the Republicans votes this time. A recent poll gave Kuchel 40 percent, Richards 38 percent and 22 percent undecided. Leaning Republican.

Colorado

Former Gov. Dan Thornton (R), an early supporter of President Eisenhower, faces ex-Rep. John A. Carroll (D 1947-51) for the seat vacated by retiring Sen. Eugene Millikin (R 1941-57). Carroll, defeated in Senate bids in 1950 and 1954, edged former Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan by 2,000 votes in the Sept. 11 Democratic primary. Thornton was the unopposed Republican choice.

Issues: Carroll has criticized the Administration record on agriculture and small business. Thornton is running as an all-out Eisenhower supporter.

Outlook: Thornton is a proved vote-getter in the state and he should benefit from Mr. Eisenhower's popularity in his favorite vacation retreat, and the home of the President's mother-in-law. Thornton's campaign got off to a faster start than Carroll's and, aided by helicopter hops, he has kept his early advantage. Carroll came close to winning in 1954, receiving 48.7 percent of the vote. Democrats count on increased farm discontent to put him over this time. But the coolness of popular Democratic Gov. Edwin C. Johnson toward Carroll is a major stumbling block. Leaning Republican.

Connecticut

Sen. Prescott Bush (R), elected in 1952 after losing in 1950, seeks his first full Senate term. He is opposed by Rep. Thomas J. Dodd (D 1951-57).

Issues: Bush is a consistent supporter of President Eisenhower, who led the Republican state ticket to victory in 1952, receiving 55.7 percent of the vote. Dodd and Bush

have clashed on the success of the Administration foreign policy and both claim credit for securing flood relief legislation in the last Congress.

Outlook: Bush, a New York investment banker, has worked hard to strengthen his popularity in the northern and western parts of the state where he was not formerly well known. Dodd, who comes from industrial Hartford, has shown himself a good campaigner, independent enough to attract some Republican votes without sacrificing his labor and nationality group support. The situation is complicated by the presence of minor party candidates on the ballot. Jasper McLevy, long-time Socialist mayor of Bridgeport, and Mrs. Suzanne Silvercruys Stevenson, candidate of the right-wing Independent Republicans, are on the ballot and Miss Vivien Kellems, manufacturer and foe of the income tax, is seeking a court order to have her name added. McLevy is expected to draw votes from Dodd, while the other two (or one) might cost Bush some support. Bush ran 100,000 votes behind the President in 1952, when Mr. Eisenhower carried the state by 130,000 votes. With Dodd's vigorous campaigning, any marked drop in the President's plurality might be fatal to Bush's chances. The race is doubtful.

Idaho

Sen. Herman Welker (R), seeking a second term, faces an unexpectedly strong battle for re-election from 32-year-old Boise Attorney Frank Church, making his first bid for public office. Both have serious intra-party troubles; neither had an outright majority in his own party's Aug. 14 primary.

In the four-man Democratic primary, Church edged ex-Sen. Glen Taylor (D 1945-51) by 200 votes. Taylor was denied a recount by the State Board of Canvassers but has continued to seek evidence of fraud or error in the tally. He has refused to support Church, hinted he might undertake a write-in campaign in the general election.

Welker received only 32,000 of the 74,000 votes cast in the Republican primary, and was charged with absenteeism, payroll scandals, "witch-hunting," neglect of state interests and failure to support the President by his primary opponents.

Issues: The leading state issues involve agricultural policy, water and reclamation. Church advocates high, rigid supports and favors the federal high dam at Hells Canyon; Welker takes the opposite stand on both.

Outlook: Church has gotten off to a faster start in his campaign, but Republican primary wounds seem to have healed better than those among Democrats. Mr. Eisenhower received 65.4 percent of the vote in 1952. His popularity, plus the threat of a Taylor write-in gives Welker the edge. Leaning Republican.

Illinois

Sen. Everett McKinley Dirksen (R), seeking a second term, is opposed by State Rep. Richard Stengel, making his first statewide race.

Issues: Dirksen has pegged his campaign to the "peace and prosperity" theme. Stengel has attacked his opponent's record on farm price supports, welfare and labor legislation.

Outlook: The Illinois situation is clouded by the unpredictable effect of a series of scandals, affecting both

parties but involving mainly the Republican state administration headed by Gov. William G. Stratton. Dirksen has not been connected to any of the scandals but Democrats hope he will be hurt by possible voter distrust of the Republican record. Dirksen is, however, far better known throughout the state than Stengel and also should benefit from Mr. Eisenhower's popularity in Adlai E. Stevenson's home state. The President received 54.8 percent of the state's vote in 1952. Additional disclosures of scandal might topple Dirksen, but now the race is Leaning Republican.

Indiana

Sen. Homer E. Capehart (R), seeking a third term, is opposed by Claude R. Wickard (D), Secretary of Agriculture and REA administrator in the Roosevelt and Truman administrations.

Issues: The farm issue is dominant, with Capehart advocating a large-scale research program to develop new uses for farm goods and Wickard endorsing 90 percent farm price supports. Wickard also disputes Capehart's claim that all foreign aid should be put on a loan basis and that labor and small business have prospered under the Eisenhower Administration.

Outlook: Democrats entered the campaign with high hopes, based on farm discontent, their sweeping victories in 1955 municipal elections and persistent feuding between Republican factions headed by Gov. George N. Craig and Sen. William E. Jenner. But Capehart has largely avoided the factional bloodshed and has shown himself a more agile campaigner than Wickard. Democrats now have intramural troubles of their own, with their nominee for governor, Mayor Ralph Tucker of Terre Haute, feuding with State Chairman Charles E. Skillen. President Eisenhower won 58.1 percent of the Indiana vote in 1952, is favored to carry the state again this year. A recent poll gave Capehart an 8 percentage point lead over Wickard. Leaning Republican.

Iowa

Sen. Bourke B. Hickenlooper (R), seeking a third term, is opposed by R.M. (Spike) Evans (D), Agricultural Adjustment administrator and Federal Reserve Board member under Democratic administrations.

Issues: The farm issue is dominant. Hickenlooper backs the Administration program of flexible farm price supports. Evans favors 90 percent of parity props.

Outlook: Republicans outpolled the Democrats by a 2-1 margin in the June 4 primary in this traditionally Republican state where Mr. Eisenhower received 63.8 percent of the vote in 1952. Recent polls indicate a shift of some farm votes to the Democrats, particularly in drought-stricken parts of the state. In other areas, however, crops this year have been good and soil bank payments in drought areas are expected to ease farmers' financial pangs. Both parties claim gains from visits by their Presidential candidates. Hickenlooper and Evans are concentrating on rural areas, where both have extensive previous acquaintances. Republicans count on small town votes to remain overwhelmingly Republican, offsetting any farm losses. Barring an unforeseen slump in farm prices this month, Hickenlooper has the edge. Leaning Republican.

Kentucky

Kentucky will elect two Senators this year. Sen. Earle C. Clements (D), seeking a second full term, is opposed by ex-Rep. Thruston Ballard Morton (R 1947-53), who resigned as Assistant Secretary of State to make the race. Seeking to fill the four years of the unexpired term of the late Sen. Alben W. Barkley (D) are ex-Gov. Lawrence W. Wetherby (D) and ex-Sen. John Sherman Cooper (R 1946-49 and 1953-55). Cooper gave up the Ambassadorship to India at White House request to make the race for the Senate.

Issues: The two Democrats have emphasized the specific projects and improvements they claim to have brought to Kentucky in their terms as Senator and governor. They have attacked their opponents' support of Administration domestic policies, particularly on farm price supports. Cooper has emphasized what he calls his greater familiarity with important problems of international relations and cites his own accomplishments in two Senate terms on behalf of Kentucky interests. Morton is running as an all-out supporter of President Eisenhower, whose Administration he says has brought peace and prosperity to the state.

Outlook: There are three big question marks in Kentucky. The first concerns the political inclinations of the young voters, casting their first Presidential ballots since the state's voting age was lowered to 18. Republicans, noting enthusiastic receptions for the President and Vice President from Kentucky's college audiences, claim the allegiance of the majority of these first voters.

The second mystery is the probable outcome of the Presidential race. Stevenson carried normally Democratic Kentucky by only 700 votes in 1952. Both parties claim the edge this year.

The biggest doubt concerns the role to be played by Democratic Gov. A.B. (Happy) Chandler, who has long been at odds with Clements and Wetherby. They attempted unsuccessfully to deny him the nomination for governor in 1955 and he fought their nominations for the Senate this year. Neither Democratic Senate candidate has endorsed Chandler's \$100 million road bond plan, on the ballot this November, while their Republican opponents have come out in favor of it. Chandler has given nominal support to the Democratic ticket, but he did not attend the party's opening rally. He did make a point of greeting Mr. Eisenhower during the President's Oct. 1 campaign foray into Kentucky.

Many observers believe Chandler will pass the word to the 18,000 state employees that he would not mind if Wetherby, at least, were defeated and Stevenson lost the state to Mr. Eisenhower. The influential and anti-Chandler Louisville Courier-Journal, which in the past had endorsed all four Senate candidates for various posts, this year is backing the two Democrats.

In the individual races, Clements has the edge on Morton. The latter was not well known outside his former Louisville congressional district, while Clements as a Senator and before that as governor kept his fences mended in all parts of the state. This race is Leaning Democratic.

In the Wetherby-Cooper contest, some observers think Cooper has a slight lead. They point out that while he was defeated for full Senate terms in 1948 and 1954, he won short term contests in 1946 and 1952. In 1952, Cooper won by 28,000 votes even while Stevenson carried the state by a narrow margin. But Wetherby is rated a

stronger candidate than Cooper's 1952 opponent. Lacking any firm evidence of a strong shift from the state's normal Democratic voting habit, this race is regarded as Doubtful.

Maryland

Sen. John Marshall Butler (R), seeking a second term, is opposed by George P. Mahoney (D), Baltimore contractor. Mahoney won the Democratic nomination after a breathtaking series of events. A perpetual candidate (he lost the Democratic gubernatorial nomination in 1950 and 1954, was defeated by Sen. J. Glenn Beall (R) in the 1952 Senate race), Mahoney was narrowly defeated in the May 7 Democratic primary by ex-Sen. Millard E. Tydings (D 1927-50). On May 28, Mahoney's forces took control of the state organization and when Tydings was forced by illness to withdraw from the race, the state committee Aug. 27 named Mahoney as nominee.

Issues: Mahoney has attacked Butler for his successful 1950 campaign against Tydings. The campaign was characterized in a Senate committee report as "despicable and back street." Mahoney also has accused Butler of voting against consumers' interests on such matters as natural gas regulation. Butler defends his role in the 1950 campaign by saying the actions criticized by the Senate committee were performed by supporters acting without his knowledge or approval. Butler also claims his work has been instrumental in bringing federal projects to Maryland and obtaining help for the vital maritime interests in the state.

Outlook: Democrats have added to their normal edge in registration, but the state is noted for its independent voting habits. Mahoney's many intra-party battles have made him an extremely controversial figure. Butler, too, has feuded with such pro-Eisenhower state Republican leaders as Gov. Theodore R. McKeldin. Publicly, both parties are united behind their nominees but there is doubt how much support they really command. Maryland gave 55.4 percent of its votes to Mr. Eisenhower in 1952, but at least as far as the Senate race is concerned, the outlook this year is Doubtful.

Missouri

Sen. Thomas C. Hennings Jr. (D), seeking re-election to a second term, is opposed by Herbert Douglas, who won the Aug. 7 Republican primary by 2,000 votes. Democrats outvoted Republicans in the primary by a 2-1 margin. Hennings was unopposed. Douglas, who is not widely known, has pledged to support President Eisenhower and hopes to draw support from the western end of the state by pointing out that both Hennings and Sen. Stuart Symington (D) are from St. Louis.

Issues: Farm policy, loyalty-security program, support of Mr. Eisenhower.

Outlook: Mr. Eisenhower carried Missouri with 50.7 percent of the vote in 1952 at the same time Symington won the Senate race with 54 percent of the vote. Parts of the state have been hard hit by drought and Democrats hope to carry the state for their national ticket this year. Republicans have been plagued with factional quarrels, have not won a top statewide office since 1946. Barring an unforeseen Eisenhower sweep, Hennings seems far ahead. Leaning Democratic.

Nevada

Sen. Alan Bible (D), elected in 1954 to fill out the term of the late Sen. Pat McCarran (D 1933-54), seeks a full six-year term against two-term Representative-at-large Clifton Young (R). Bible first announced his plans to retire, then June 21 under pressure from national Democratic leaders re-entered the race against three primary election opponents. He won an unexpectedly easy victory in the Sept. 4 primary and the party has united behind his bid against Young, who had no primary opposition. Bible, often an indifferent campaigner in the past, has pulled together all elements of McCarran's powerful organization to meet the challenge posed by Young, a vigorous campaigner.

Issues: The state's economic progress, which Young says Bible has done little to promote; the controversy over Navy acquisition of a large tract of land for an aerial gunnery range, supported by Young but opposed by some ranchers and sportsmen.

Outlook: Mr. Eisenhower's popularity (he carried the state with 61.4 percent of the vote in 1952) plus the prospects of a Democratic split made Young's chances seem good in August, when the race was rated Doubtful. Bible's strong showing in the primary plus his strong backing from all elements of the organization now make it Leaning Democratic.

New York

Mayor Robert F. Wagner Jr. (D) of New York City and ex-Rep. Jacob K. Javits (R 1947-55), now state attorney general, are seeking the Senate seat vacated by Sen. Herbert H. Lehman (D).

Issues: Both men are considered to be in the liberal wing of their parties, both are internationalists, both strong advocates of civil rights. Javits has claimed that his experience on the House Foreign Relations Committee gives him better background to deal with major questions of foreign policy, but Wagner replies that he has discussed foreign policy matters with world leaders visiting New York City and during his own trips abroad. Wagner has sought to link Javits to conservative forces in the Republican party and Javits has replied that Wagner's election might enable southern segregationist Senators to control key committees.

Outlook: Both parties have nominated their strongest candidates and the race is a close one. The Liberal party, often a deciding factor in such close contests, has endorsed Wagner. Wagner, a Catholic married to a Quaker, has been a popular mayor of New York City, a point Republicans have sought to turn against him by arguing that his temporary successor would not be capable of running the city. His father and namesake, the late Senator, is identified with many pieces of key New Deal legislation, particularly in the labor field, and the Wagner name is expected to draw strong labor support. Javits was the sole successful Republican candidate on the 1954 state ticket, defeating Franklin D. Roosevelt Jr. for attorney general. Republicans are hopeful that Javits, a Jew, will reduce the normally heavily Democratic vote in New York City. An unmeasurable factor is the effect of Javits' September appearance before the Senate Judiciary Internal Security Subcommittee to deny reports that he had sought Communist support in 1946, when he began his political career. The race may turn on the Presidential contest, where Mr. Eisenhower, who received 55.4 percent

of the vote in 1952, again is a slight favorite. With both candidates campaigning hard since their nomination Sept. 10, this race is very much in the Doubtful category.

North Dakota

Sen. Milton R. Young (R), seeking a third term, is opposed by Quentin Burdick (D), Fargo attorney and son of GOP Rep. Usher Burdick, and Independent A.C. Townley, who filed Sept. 27. Townley is a leader in the state's Nonpartisan League (NPL). The majority of the NPL March 29 voted to switch its endorsements from the Republican to the Democratic tickets. Townley is a leader of the NPL's Old Guard faction, which refused to go along with the switch.

Issues: Both Young and Burdick favor high, rigid farm supports, of primary concern to this agricultural state. Burdick has taxed his opponent with the Republican party's stand against rigid supports. Young has maintained voters should support him and Mr. Eisenhower to assure their farm interests and "leadership for peace."

Outlook: The NPL switch, triggered by farm discontent, has raised Democratic hopes in this normally Republican state. But influential Sen. William F. Langer (R), an NPL leader, has decided to stay with the Republicans because of "their record for keeping us out of war." Crops have been good in North Dakota the past two years. Townley's candidacy may draw off some Old Guard votes that might otherwise have gone to Young, but his own stand on farm price supports seems to insure Young's return to the Senate. Leaning Republican.

Ohio

Sen. George H. Bender (R), elected in 1954 to fill out the remaining two years of the term of the late Sen. Robert A. Taft (R), seeks a full term. He is opposed by five-term Gov. Frank J. Lausche (D).

Issues: Bender is running as an all-out supporter of President Eisenhower and attacks Lausche for "evading national issues." Lausche, who has repeatedly praised Mr. Eisenhower and agrees with many Administration policies, emphasizes his record as governor and depends on his personal following for election.

Outlook: Lausche went into the race with a decided edge, having been re-elected governor in 1952 when Mr. Eisenhower swept Ohio and winning again in 1954 by 212,000 votes while Bender won his Senate seat by only 2,970 votes. However, Lausche, always an independent, angered many organization Democrats by hinting he might vote with the Republicans to organize the Senate. Later, he said his remark had been misunderstood and he has attended Democratic rallies and pledged support to the party's candidate for governor, Michael V. DiSalle. Bender, an industrious campaigner, has strengthened Republican committees in all 88 Ohio counties and has a large campaign fund available. He received the full endorsement of Mr. Eisenhower at the President's Oct. 1 Cleveland appearance and Mr. Eisenhower, who received 56.8 percent of the Ohio vote in 1952, is favored to carry the state again. Lausche's phenomenal personal popularity may still give him a slight edge, but the race, once clearly Leaning Democratic, now must be rated Doubtful.

Oregon

Sen. Wayne Morse (D), twice elected as a Republican, is opposed by ex-Governor and ex-Secretary of Interior Douglas McKay (R).

Issues: Republicans charge party-switching Morse is a "turncoat" who has "been on every side of every issue," has maligned President Eisenhower and has been ineffective in securing legislation of interest to the state. Democrats say McKay was "shoved down the throats" of Oregon Republicans by the White House, claim his record as an Administration official was one of "giving away national resources and opposing low-cost power projects."

Outlook: In this grudge fight, both parties have made large resources available to their candidates. Morse has labor support but has apparently lost much of the business and independent support he had as a Republican. He is rated a better campaigner than McKay, but the latter has strong ties to state veterans' groups, while Morse has no military service record of his own. President Eisenhower received 60.5 percent of the Oregon vote in 1952, but both Stevenson and Kefauver have campaigned widely in the state since then. A recent poll gave Morse 43 percent of the vote, McKay 38 percent and 19 percent undecided. Morse may have a slight edge now but with both sides going all out, the outcome is Doubtful.

Pennsylvania

Sen. James H. Duff (R), seeking a second term, is opposed by Joseph S. Clark Jr. (D), former mayor of Philadelphia.

Issues: Clark has charged Duff with absenteeism, neglect of state interests. He charges the Eisenhower Administration is a "single-interest" government that has impaired the position of small business, farmers and labor. Duff has defended his Senate record, linked Clark to Americans for Democratic Action and called for his own re-election as an endorsement of the Eisenhower program of "peace and prosperity." Republicans also have attacked Democratic Gov. George M. Leader for allegedly forcing state employees to contribute to the Democratic campaign fund.

Outlook: Democrats have staged a real revival in President Eisenhower's home state, now control the state government and run both Philadelphia and Pittsburgh, with the accompanying patronage. They are united behind Clark and have strong financial backing for the campaign. The Republicans' statewide registration edge has been cut 60 percent since 1952. Republicans, on the other hand, have been split between Duff's pro-Eisenhower wing and the Old Guard, which regained control of the state organization last spring. However, in recent weeks, rival leaders have pledged publicly to support Duff and national Republican officials have promised an all-out effort to hold the seat. Duff was an original Eisenhower supporter and the President carried the state with 52.7 percent of the vote in 1952. Clark, 55, has campaigned harder than 73-year-old Duff and appears to have the edge in what could develop into a very close race. Leaning Democratic.

South Dakota

Sen. Francis Case (R), seeking re-election to a second term, is opposed by Kenneth Holum, a farmer who ran unsuccessfully for the Senate in 1954, receiving 42.7 percent of the vote. Mr. Eisenhower carried the state in 1952 with 69.3 percent of the vote and is expected to win it handily again this year.

Issues: Holum is criticizing the Administration's farm program, although Case voted in the Senate for 90 percent price supports. Small business problems, the state assessment system and Case's controversial disclosure of a \$2,500 campaign contribution offer from a gas bill lobbyist are also issues.

Outlook: The race was regarded as Safe Republican two months ago, with Mr. Eisenhower and popular Republican Gov. Joe Foss heading the ticket in a normally Republican state. While Case still holds a sizeable lead, increased Democratic organizational effort, Farmers Union strength and signs of farm disaffection transfer it to the Leaning Republican category.

Utah

Sen. Wallace F. Bennett (R), seeking his second Senate term, is opposed by State Sen. Alonzo F. Hopkin, a conservative Democrat and dean of the State Senate. Hopkin decisively defeated ex-Gov. Herbert B. Maw in the Sept. 11 Democratic primary. Bennett was unopposed and did not participate openly in the intra-party struggle that saw controversial two-term Gov. J. Bracken Lee (R) defeated by George D. Clyde in the Republican gubernatorial primary.

Issues: Drought relief, agricultural policies, aid to mining.

Outlook: In a conservative state, both candidates are moderates, both Mormons. Hopkin is rated by local observers as the more colorful campaigner, but Bennett has been a consistent supporter of President Eisenhower, who received 58.9 percent of the vote in 1952 and has won additional friends by backing embattled Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson, a resident of Utah and a leader of the Mormon Church. Supporters of Gov. Lee could hurt Republican chances if they stayed away from the polls, but the race is Leaning Republican.

Washington

Sen. Warren G. Magnuson (D), seeking a third term in the Senate, is opposed by three-term Gov. Arthur B. Langlie (R).

Issues: Power policy, as reflected in Magnuson's support and Langlie's opposition to the federal dam at Hells Canyon, agricultural policy and aid to Washington industry are major topics in the campaign.

Outlook: The match between the two parties' champion vote-getters was rated a toss-up until the Sept. 11 primary. Neither Langlie nor Magnuson had opposition but the Senator drew 150,000 more votes than his rival in the unofficial popularity contest, marking him as the favorite in the race. Magnuson has solid labor backing, particularly important this year because unions are mobilizing their membership in an all-out effort to defeat a "right-to-work" referendum

in the state. He also is supported by many businessmen who regard him as an expert on smoothing their dealings with Washington officials. Langlie, urged by the White House to enter the Senate race, can expect help from President Eisenhower, who received 54.3 percent of the Washington vote in 1952. He has been a popular governor, is known as a strong family man and an active lay religious leader. However, the race, once Doubtful, is now regarded as Leaning Democratic.

West Virginia

Gov. William C. Marland (D) and ex-Sen. Chapman Revercomb (R 1943-49) are seeking to fill the remaining two years of the unexpired term of the late Sen. Harley M. Kilgore (D). Both are controversial figures. Marland has had to deal with charges of scandal in the state administration and has differed with high-up Democrats over patronage. In 1948, Revercomb, aligned with the conservative faction in the strife-torn state Republican organization, lost the support of Presidential Candidate Thomas E. Dewey because of his opposition to displaced persons legislation. Neither Marland nor Revercomb won an outright majority in their parties' May 8 primary, when Democrats outvoted Republicans by a 3-2 margin.

Issues: The candidates' records as governor and Senator.

Outlook: Traditionally Democratic West Virginia gave Adlai E. Stevenson 51.9 percent of the vote in 1952, the only state not in the Deep South to give Stevenson a majority. Since then, there has been an exodus of coal miners, backbone of the Democratic strength, from the state. The coal industry has picked up in recent months and Republicans hope to make capital of the current prosperity. Estimates differ on the degree to which splits within each party have healed, but the state's normal political complexion gives the edge to Marland. Leaning Democratic.

Wisconsin

Sen. Alexander Wiley (R), in the Senate 18 years, is opposed by State Sen. Henry W. Maier (D) of Milwaukee. Wiley survived a bitter battle in the Sept. 11 primary, defeating organization-endorsed Rep. Glenn R. Davis by 10,000 votes. Maier won an easy victory in the Democratic contest.

Issues: Wiley emphasizes his services to the state, his support of President Eisenhower's foreign policy as ranking Republican on the Foreign Relations Committee. Maier has attacked the Administration domestic policies, particularly on farm and labor matters.

Outlook: Republican organization leaders who opposed Wiley in the primary have now pledged him their support. Democrats have been discomfited by their nominee for governor, William Proxmire, repudiating the party's candidate for attorney general, Robert LaFollette Sucher. Wisconsin is normally Republican. Mr. Eisenhower received 61 percent of the vote in 1952. Wiley is widely known and received considerable independent and Democratic support in his primary fight. He has a sizeable lead on Maier. Leaning Republican.

LOBBIES TO PRESS FOR NEW CO-OP TAX LAWS

Twelve lobby organizations plan to combine efforts in 1957 to force Congress to revise tax laws affecting co-operatives.

The National Tax Equality Assn. which has been fighting against "co-op tax advantages" for 13 years has pledged of support from banker, cotton industry, retail druggist, wholesale hardware dealer and dairy groups. (See accompanying group profiles) These groups say current tax laws place them in an adverse competitive position with the co-operatives.

Getting an early start for the 1957 Congressional session, the 12 organizations conferred in Chicago Oct. 12. Garner M. Lester, NTEA president, will speak on "Tax Equality, Now and in the Future," and preside at the conference.

A highlight of the conference will be the premiere of the color motion picture, "The Senator's Daughter," which, according to NTEA, "demonstrates the economic consequences of tax avoidance and ably brings out the fact that 'tax equality' is 'good politics'." The new film, like its black and white predecessor, "Citizen Dave Douglas," will be shown before groups in several parts of the country.

Reps. Clifford Davis (D Tenn.), Noah M. Mason (R Ill.), who sponsored legislation advocated by NTEA during the last session of Congress, and T. Coleman Andrews, former Commissioner of Internal Revenue, will speak.

Businessmen being urged to attend the conference are told they will "be advised as to the most effective cause of united action to bring about the needed remedial legislation."

A study of the organizations involved in the fight against the co-ops indicates duplicate representation. Loring A. Schuler, executive secretary for the National Associated Businessmen in Washington, is also a member of Scott and Schuler, a public relations firm in Chicago. Vernon Scott of the same firm is vice president of NTEA. Schuler is also a member of the Trade Assns. Information Committee (See profile below). Leonard J. Calhoun, registered as lobbyist for NTEA in 1951, is a co-chairman of the Trade Assns. Committee and is general counsel for the Public Information Committee of the Cotton Industries.

Robert H. North, a registered lobbyist for the International Assn. of Ice Cream Manufacturers, is also a co-chairman of the Trade Assns. Committee. Benjamin F. Castle is a registered lobbyist for the Milk Industry Foundation and a member of the Trade Assns. Committee.

Co-op Tax Background

Tax exemption for co-operatives dates from 1913 when Congress imposed the income tax on corporations. That law excluded "labor, agricultural or horticultural organizations" and other non-profit groups. The exemption was spelled out in more detail in 1916 and in 1918 was broadened to include associations having capital stock. In 1921 the exemption was changed to include co-ops "organized...as purchasing agents for the purpose of pur-

chasing supplies and equipment for the use of members... at actual cost."

The most recent action on this issue by Congress was taken in the Revenue Act of 1951 (PL 183, 82nd Congress) which required co-ops to pay corporate income taxes on earnings which they did not allocate to patrons within 8 1/2 months following the year in which the money was earned. (1951 Almanac, p. 409)

Patronage Dividends

The 1951 Act also provided that patronage dividends distributed by the co-ops to owner-patrons would be taxable as individual income. However, because in many cases these dividends are distributed in forms other than cash, the question of taxing the dividends went to the courts. In the case of Commissioner of Internal Revenue vs. B.A. Carpenter, involving a patronage dividend paid in "revolving fund certificates" which "had no fair market value," the court sided with Carpenter. In rendering its decision March 2, 1955, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth District said "before a cash basis taxpayer may be charged with the receipt of income, he must receive cash or property having a fair market value, or such cash or property must be unqualifiedly subject to his demand. We are of the opinion that the certificates...did not constitute income" and therefore are not taxable. Other recent court decisions on this issue have been similar.

Thus, under existing law unless these patronage dividends are paid in a form of cash, they are not taxable. The law also exempts co-operatives from payment of federal taxes on patronage refunds that are distributed to members, whether in cash, in stock, in certificates of indebtedness or merely by allocation on the corporations' books. Farm co-ops also are exempt from taxes on dividends paid on outstanding capital stock, but otherwise pay the same taxes as corporations.

A list of the groups which will fight for a revision of co-op tax laws in 1956 on grounds the co-ops enjoy unfair competitive advantages:

NTEA

NAME -- National Tax Equality Assn., 231 S. LaSalle St., Chicago 4, Ill.

RANKING OFFICER -- President, Garner M. Lester, "small businessman and farmer," Jackson, Miss.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER -- Executive vice president, H. Vernon Scott, Chicago, Ill.

LEGISLATIVE REPRESENTATIVES -- Paul Lawrence Courtney, Clare A. Johnson, Joseph Leopold, Leonard J. Calhoun, Gerald D. Morgan, Edward S. Hartman and Paul Martin are registered under the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act.

MEMBERSHIP -- 8,000 individual businesses.

PURPOSE -- Founded in 1943 to "promote the interests of the particular business groups that are placed at competitive disadvantage because of tax disparition."

REPORTED SPENDING -- 1956 first half, none filed; 1955, \$17,272.

Information Committee

NAME -- Trade Assns. Information Committee for the Taxation of Co-operatives, 410 Washington Bldg., Washington, 5, D.C.

RANKING OFFICERS -- Co-chairmen, Leonard J. Calhoun, general counsel, Public Information Committee of the Cotton Industries, and Robert H. North, International Assn. of Ice Cream Manufacturers.

EXECUTIVE OFFICERS -- Same as above.

LEGISLATIVE REPRESENTATIVE -- None.

MEMBERSHIP -- Co-chairmen and Paul H. Bolton of the National Assn. of Wholesalers, Benjamin F. Castle of the Milk Industry Foundation, C.D. Hudson of the National Wooden Box Assn., and Loring A. Schuler of National Associated Businessmen. Claims the support of 500 trade association groups.

PURPOSE -- Founded in 1954 to "act as an information clearing house and coordinating center. ...Contacts only the executives of trade associations, who...interpret and circulate to their own members data supplied by the Committee."

REPORTED SPENDING -- Since the Committee is not registered under the lobby law, no reports are required.

Cotton Industries Group

NAME -- Public Information Committee of the Cotton Industries, 410 Washington Bldg., Washington 5, D.C.

RANKING OFFICER -- Chairman, Harry S. Baker, Producers Cotton Oil Co., Fresno, Calif.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER -- General counsel, Leonard J. Calhoun, Washington, D.C.

LEGISLATIVE REPRESENTATIVE -- Calhoun is registered under the lobby law.

MEMBERSHIP -- Committee has 24 members and claims authority to represent 5,000 cotton farmers, ginners, shippers, compresses and warehouses and cottonseed oil mills.

PURPOSE -- Founded in 1954 to examine "federal, state and local tax favoritism and other governmental advantages enjoyed by co-operative corporations in the cotton industries, and their resulting competitive advantages over their fully taxed competitors...."

REPORTED SPENDING -- 1956 first half, \$27,626; 1955, \$61,571.

Ice Cream Manufacturers

NAME -- International Assn. of Ice Cream Manufacturers, 1105 Barr Bldg., Washington 6, D.C.

RANKING OFFICER -- President, Hugh F. Hutchinson, president of Greenbrier Dairy Products Co., Lewisburg, W. Va.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER -- Executive secretary, Robert C. Hibben, Washington, D.C.

LEGISLATIVE REPRESENTATIVES -- Hibben and Robert H. North are registered under the lobby law.

MEMBERSHIP -- 2,212 ice cream companies and branches in the U.S., 103 companies in Canada and 35 foreign ice cream manufacturers.

PURPOSE -- Founded in 1900 "to give the industry the services and activities that business procedure and governmental activities call for."

REPORTED SPENDING -- 1956, first half, none filed; 1955, none filed.

Conference Sponsors

Sponsors of a one-day conference in Chicago Oct. 12, 1956, to mobilize for a campaign to revise co-op tax laws:

American Retail Coal Assn.
Bankers Committee for Tax Equality.
Independent Livestock Marketing Assn.
Joint Committee on Taxation of the International Assn. of Ice Cream Manufacturers and the Milk Industry Foundation.
National Associated Businessmen, Inc.
National Assn. of Retail Druggists.
National Assn. of Wholesalers.
National Building Material Distributors Assn.
National Retail Furniture Assn.
National Tax Equality Assn.
National Wholesale Hardware Assn.
Public Information Committee of the Cotton Industries.

Milk Industry

NAME -- Milk Industry Foundation, 1145 19th St. N.W., Washington 6, D.C.

RANKING OFFICER -- President, C. Raymond Brock, president of Brock-Hall Dairy Co., New Haven, Conn.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER -- Staff secretary, Ernest B. Kellogg, Washington, D.C.

LEGISLATIVE REPRESENTATIVE -- Benjamin F. Castle is registered under the lobby law.

MEMBERSHIP -- 1,000 milk dealers.

PURPOSE -- Founded in 1936 to provide trade association services to members.

REPORTED SPENDING -- 1956 first half, "none;" 1955, "none."

Ice Cream Committee

NAME -- Joint Committee on Taxation of the International Assn. of Ice Cream Manufacturers and the Milk Industry Foundation.

RANKING OFFICER -- Chairman Vernon F. Hovey, former chairman of the board of General Ice Cream Corp., Schenectady, N.Y. Hovey registered under the lobby law on Jan. 6, 1956. Listing no employer, he said his interest was "legislation to terminate unfair tax advantages of co-operative corporations in the dairy industry."

On Feb. 3 the Co-operative League of the U.S. said that while there were co-operatives in the membership of the Milk Foundation none was represented on the new Joint Committee and accused the Foundation of "some bald-faced double dealing."

Case Against Co-ops

Garner Lester, NTEA president, presented to the national conventions of both political parties the arguments against the current tax provisions applying to co-operatives.

In similar statements presented to the Democrats Aug. 9 and the Republicans Aug. 15, Lester said his purpose was to "call attention (to) the patronage dividend loophole" in the current income tax law. He added that small businessmen are "finding...tax-free competition disheartening and overwhelming" and that 36 other trade

and civic organizations with a combined membership of over 200,000 were supporting NTEA in the statement.

Lester argued the "present income tax treatment of corporations in co-operative form is having a tremendous impact upon the fully taxed corporations with which they compete. The policy of the tax law to accord co-operatives special treatment has resulted in their phenomenal growth to the detriment of fully taxed businesses operating in competition with them, and at the same time has substantially reduced tax revenues.

"The privilege which has been extended to co-operatives, which is not enjoyed by other business organizations, is the right to deduct from taxable income the profits which are distributed to shareholders on a patronage basis. This deduction is allowed without regard to the form in which such distributions are made....."

Co-op Position

Co-op spokesmen also carried their arguments to the conventions of the national parties. Special emphasis was given the problem of tax status for farmer co-operatives in the testimony given by the National Council of Farmer Co-operatives.

In a supplementary statement on the tax issue, the Council said "huge sums of money" are being spent for the purpose of "creating the erroneous impression...that neither farmer co-operatives nor their patrons pay any federal income taxes.... Congress...from the early years of enactment of income tax laws has provided by statute that farmer co-operatives which are owned and controlled by farmers...which meet stringent requirements designed to require operation of the co-operative for the primary benefit of their farmer members and patrons could deduct from their taxable income the amount paid out as dividends on capital and could, in addition, set aside reasonable reserves for necessary purposes. The cash received as dividends on capital is, of course, taxed to the recipients....

"The clear intent of the Congress in enacting that portion of the Revenue Act of 1951 dealing with the tax treatment of farmer co-operatives was that earnings resulting from operations of farmer co-operatives should be taxed once, and once only, either to the co-operative or to the patron, as determined by the contractual agreement between the co-operative and its patrons. Several court decisions since 1951 are tending to prevent the full realization of this Congressional intent. The Council advocates and stands ready to work for the passage of legislation to properly implement the Congressional intent with respect to the taxation of farmer co-operatives and their patrons as contemplated by the Revenue Act of 1951."

Farmer Co-ops

NAME -- National Council of Farmer Co-operatives, 744 Jackson Place N.W., Washington 6, D.C.

RANKING OFFICER -- President, Marvin J. Briggs, general manager, Indiana Farm Bureau Co-operative Assns., Indianapolis, Ind.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER -- Executive vice president, Homer L. Brinkley, Washington, D.C.

LEGISLATIVE REPRESENTATIVES -- Kit H. Haynes, L. James Harmanson Jr., John J. Riggle, Homer L. Brinkley and Glen A. Wilkinson are registered under the lobby law.

MEMBERSHIP -- 122 farmer co-operatives which engage in marketing the products of their members or en-

gage in purchasing farm production supplies for their members.

PURPOSE -- To represent membership in contacts with other groups and government on matters affecting the business and activities of farmer co-operatives.

REPORTED SPENDING -- 1956 first half, \$4,057; 1955, \$17,940.

Co-op League

NAME -- Co-operative League of the U.S.A., 343 S. Dearborn St., Chicago 4, Ill.

RANKING OFFICER -- President, Murray D. Lincoln, president of Nationwide Insurance Cos., Columbus, Ohio.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER -- Executive director, ex-Rep. Jerry Voorhis (D Calif., 1937-47)

LEGISLATIVE REPRESENTATIVE -- Voorhis and Wallace Campbell, director of the Washington office, are registered under the lobby law.

MEMBERSHIP -- 20 regional and national co-operative organizations including the Credit Union National Assn. and the National Rural Electric Co-operative Assn.

PURPOSE -- Founded in 1916 to serve as trade association and educational forum for all types of co-operatives; to help provide training in organization and other matters to regional and local co-op members and to represent co-ops on the legislative front."

REPORTED SPENDING -- 1956 first half, none filed; 1955, none filed.

Milk Producers

NAME -- National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 Eye St. N.W., Washington 6, D.C.

RANKING OFFICER -- President, Russell S. Waltz, general manager, United Dairymen's Assn., Seattle, Wash.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER -- Secretary, E.M. Norton.

LEGISLATIVE REPRESENTATIVES -- Norton, H. Willis Tobler, Patrick B. Healy and Marion R. Garstang are registered under the lobby law.

MEMBERSHIP -- 800 dairy co-operatives representing 500,000 dairy farmers.

PURPOSE -- Founded in 1917 "to create and maintain a healthy economic atmosphere for the milk producer...to concern itself with legislation, with government policies, with administrative rules and regulations, with tariffs and subsidies, with labor relations, and with numerous other influences which have nationwide application."

REPORTED SPENDING -- 1956 first half, \$8,536; 1955, \$10,012.

Tax Issue

The business groups contend existing law permits co-ops to keep the cash they make and use it for expansion or other purposes without losing part of it to taxes. These interests recommend taxation of co-ops at the corporate level before dividends are distributed to patrons.

Co-op spokesmen reply that earnings from co-operative activity are not profits and do not legally belong to the co-ops. They contend that the taxes proposed by NTEA and other groups would drive many of the co-operatives out of business. Jerry Voorhis of the Co-operative League June 25 admitted some changes were needed "to close up a tax loophole the courts handed us" and proposed that all forms of patronage dividends be made taxable whether cash or non-cash allocations were made.

ENGINEERS ENDORSE EISENHOWER

The Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers Oct. 9 endorsed President Eisenhower for re-election. The independent, 80,000-member rail union supported Adlai Stevenson in 1952.

Grand Chief Engineer Guy L. Brown, in a letter to Republican National Committee Chairman Leonard W. Hall, said he was firmly convinced that President Eisenhower "was making a sincere, honest effort to be the President of all the people of the United States." Brown said "I believe it would be a terrible mistake for the people of this country to make a change in the Administration.... The degree of prosperity we now have can be attributed directly to the policies that have been enunciated and followed by President Eisenhower."

INVESTIGATES OWN UNIONS

The five-man AFL-CIO Ethical Practices Committee Oct. 2 began a series of closed hearings on three AFL-CIO unions suspected of being dominated by racketeers. The Committee, headed by Al Hayes, president of the International Assn. of Machinists, said recommendations to the AFL-CIO Executive Council may not be ready before next February.

The unions under investigation are the 25,000-member Distillery, Rectifying and Wine Workers, the 72,000-member Laundry Workers International and the 73,000-member Allied Industrial Workers of America. The unions face possible suspension or expulsion.

SEEKS INTEGRATION PARLEY

The American Veterans Committee Oct. 5 asked President Eisenhower to join with Adlai Stevenson, Democratic Presidential candidate, in a "pledge to use the facilities of the Presidency to call together governors of the states and responsible officials, as well as other national leaders, to deal with the serious problem of integrating our schools."

The AVC message said that such a pledge "would take this issue out of politics and place it where it should be, as a matter of national importance, above and beyond the 'campaign oratory' of a Presidential campaign."

The veterans organization said President Eisenhower had made a similar pledge in 1952, adding "Action by you now in this field will not be out of line with your past promise."

RIGHT WING SCORED

The National Committee for an Effective Congress Oct. 11 said "the radical right faces the possibility of a massive reduction in force" in the 1956 Senatorial election. The group listed as "extremists" five men, all Republicans, whose Senate seats are in jeopardy: John Marshall Butler (Md.), Homer E. Capehart (Ind.), Everett McKinley Dirksen (Ill.), Bourke B. Hickenlooper (Iowa) and Herman Welker (Idaho). The NCEC said "in only one state is a radical right candidate bidding for a

new seat." Former Republican Sen. Chapman Revercomb (1943-49) and Gov. William C. Marland (D) are running in West Virginia for the seat vacated by the death of Harley M. Kilgore (D 1941-56). The Committee said "indications are that Governor Marland will hold that spot for the Democrats."

HITS CHEAP LABOR

The National Agricultural Workers Union (AFL-CIO) Oct. 2 said high officials of the Administration had approved a "private deal engineered by California corporation farm operators" to import Japanese contract laborers for California farms.

H.L. Mitchell, president of the Agricultural Workers, said he received a report of the arrival in San Francisco of a contingent of "over 1,000" Japanese workers being brought into the United States under an agreement made by farm employer associations and the Council for Supplementary Agricultural Workers of Japan.

The AFL-CIO union official said that "upon making inquiry" he found the agreement was approved by the Department of Labor, Immigration Service and Department of State. Mitchell said the Department of Labor should "protect the welfare of all workers...and underemployed agricultural workers in Alabama, Arkansas and Mississippi" should be offered "the better jobs in California."

The Agricultural Workers said "while the Department of Labor is engaged in importing nearly half a million foreign workers a year, the ratio of wages paid agricultural workers throughout the U.S. has fallen from 48 percent of factory earnings in 1946 to 32 percent in 1956."

AID TO SCHOOLS

Martha A. Shull, president of the National Education Assn., Oct. 3 said she hopes the dispute among politicians over the school aid bill means it "might get through" in the next session of Congress.

The Democrats and Republicans have been blaming each other for failure of Congress to pass school legislation this year. (Weekly Report, p. 1199, 1202)

The NEA head said "there is no point in theorizing on which (party) is to blame" for defeating the school aid bill. Miss Shull said some blame for killing the bill was to be laid to both parties. She said "what is important is a positive school support program in the next session of Congress" and hoped that the program would be bipartisan.

UMW CONVENTION

The United Mine Workers of America at its 42nd annual convention at Cincinnati, Ohio, Oct. 3-9 announced an agreement with the Bituminous Coal Operators Assn. had increased miners' basic daily wage to \$22.35.

In other developments, Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell Oct. 9 told the convention the Eisenhower Administration was investigating charges by John L. Lewis,

UMW president, that the Tennessee Valley Authority was violating the law by buying non-union coal for its power plants. Mitchell said the Eisenhower Administration had brought the greatest era of industrial peace in the nation's history.

The UMW, largest U.S. independent union, did not endorse either party's Presidential candidate. Lewis Oct. 2 said he would probably vote for Stevenson but only "as a patriotic duty" because he "couldn't" support Eisenhower. On Oct. 3 Lewis asked convention delegates to recall "how hard it was under the preceding Democratic administration" to negotiate contracts because of "injunctions and compulsory arbitration." The UMW in 1952 endorsed Adlai Stevenson, Democratic Presidential candidate.

INDEPENDENT CANDIDATES' PLATFORM

T. Coleman Andrews, former director of Internal Revenue, and ex-Rep. Thomas H. Werdel (R Calif., 1949-53), independent candidates for President and Vice President, Oct. 7 announced an eight-point platform.

The platform promised "undeviating" respect for state and individual rights and pledged "enormous reduction in government spending and drastic tax reform." They pledged to substitute a "well balanced revenue program" for the federal income tax.

The eight points were as follows:

1. STATES RIGHTS -- "Without this respect (for state and individual rights) there can be neither a true union of sovereign states nor personal liberty...there can be only tyranny."

2. TAX REFORM -- "The income tax is thoroughly un-American. It is right out of the Communists' Manifesto which states frankly that the surest way to destroy a capitalist society is by steeply graduated income taxes." If the income tax "cannot be shorn of its evils -- and we seriously doubt that it can -- then it must go."

3. SOCIALISM -- "Reversal of the dangerous trend toward socialism at work in the U.S. today."

4. COMMUNISM -- "An alert, vigorous and unceasing battle to eradicate Communism."

5. STATUS OF FORCES TREATY -- "Defenders of our flag must not be placed at the mercy of foreign courts where trial is conducted in a foreign tongue, and where the law assumes any one accused is guilty." (Weekly Report, p. 694)

6. BRICKER AMENDMENT -- The original Bricker Amendment or "an effective alternative" must be passed "to end reckless treaty and agreement making by the executive branch of the government." (Weekly Report, p. 271)

7. ATLANTIC UNION -- "Utter, complete rejection of Atlantic Union and world government.... We want no socialistic world organization chipping away American sovereignty and independence."

8. MILITARY SECURITY -- "Creation of permanent, overwhelming American air superiority, supported by adequate modern surface forces, (including) an end to military conscription.... In the next war, decision will come from the sky; it will come quickly; it will be reached with the men and weapons ready when the war starts."

LEGION ASKS INVESTIGATION

The American Legion Oct. 3 asked the House Un-American Activities Committee to investigate the American Civil Liberties Union. The Legion called on the ACLU to prove that "the Communist party in the United States does not constitute a danger, as it contended in a recent brief which it filed before the Supreme Court."

W.C. (Dan) Daniel, legion commander, said "the validity and constitutionality of the Smith (Anti-Communist) Act are not dependent upon the relative strength of the Communist party in the U.S." The Legion condemns ACLU suggestion that the strength of the Communist party "has been so slight since 1950 that it could not be supposed that any attempt to overthrow the government by force would be feasible in the foreseeable future."

UNION ENDORSES STEVENSON

The Upholsterers' International Union (AFL-CIO) Oct. 3 adopted a "full length argument" which it will send to its members urging them to vote for Adlai E. Stevenson for President and Sen. Estes Kefauver (D Tenn.) for Vice President in November.

The statement stressed that "each union member was a self-reliant free voter," but gave as arguments for opposing the Eisenhower-Nixon ticket:

- The Eisenhower Administration has "furnished a narrow range of leadership, picking its appointees from big business."
- Peace claims of the GOP are "phony and synthetic."
- Only real progress made in the past Administration was opposed by the President.
- Eisenhower represents "only part-time, retired Chairman of Corporation Board" leadership.

EISENHOWER ON VETERANS

Cooper T. Holt, commander-in-chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Sept. 29 said his organization had received a letter from President Eisenhower stating that he agrees with the philosophy that service in time of war is "extraordinary service."

"The President's statement should be heartwarming to all veterans," Holt said, "he has repudiated that portion of the Bradley Commission Report which holds that military service is an 'ordinary' duty of citizenship that warrants no special consideration."

President Eisenhower Jan. 14, 1955, established the President's Commission on Veterans' Pensions, headed by Gen. Omar N. Bradley. The Commission report said "changes in our national security requirements and in the nature of warfare are forcing us to reshape our traditional concepts of military service as the basis for special privilege and benefits." (Weekly Report, p. 630)

In his letter to the VFW Sept. 26, the President said "I honestly feel that every man who has borne the brunt of battle, and indeed, all the men and women who have served faithfully in an active theatre of operations have performed an extraordinary service to this country." He said the country had a "sentimental attachment and feeling of obligation" for veterans, "which I trust will never die."

Holt said he has asked Adlai Stevenson, the Democratic Presidential nominee, to express his views on the veterans welfare program.

JUSTICE BRENNAN

President Eisenhower Sept. 29 selected William Joseph Brennan Jr. of Rumson, N.J., to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court. The 50-year-old Democrat, an Associate Justice of the New Jersey Supreme Court, will succeed Justice Sherman Minton, scheduled to retire Oct. 15. (Weekly Report, p. 1129)

Brennan will serve under a recess appointment, pending confirmation by the Senate when Congress convenes in January. Confirmation of Brennan would leave the Court's political lineup unchanged at six Democrats and three Republicans. Although a registered Democrat, Brennan said he never has taken an active part in politics. The appointment was President Eisenhower's third to the Supreme Court. Previously he appointed Chief Justice Earl Warren and Associate Justice John Marshall Harlan, two Republicans.

COURT ROUNDUP

The Supreme Court Oct. 8 agreed to rule on whether Congressional committees can compel witnesses to identify one-time Communists. At issue was the contempt of Congress conviction of John T. Watkins of Rock Island, Ill., an organizer for the United Auto Workers (AFL-CIO) who refused to answer questions concerning persons he believed to have been Communists before the House Un-American Activities Committee in 1954. Watkins' conviction was reversed by a three-judge appeals court panel Jan. 26, but the full Court later upheld the conviction. (Weekly Report, p. 215)

The Court also:

Declined to review a case involving segregation in a Virginia state park which the state has kept closed for two years in the face of a lower court ruling it must be open equally to all races. The action left in effect the lower court ruling that the state could not operate or lease its park in any way which would discriminate against Negroes.

Refused to reconsider its May 21 decision that state right-to-work laws could not be applied to the railroad industry. The unanimous decision upheld an amendment to the National Railway Labor Act that authorized railroads and unions to enter into union shop agreements. (Weekly Report, p. 621)

The Tennessee Supreme Court Oct. 5 ruled that state school segregation laws were unenforceable as a result of the U.S. Supreme Court's 1954 decision outlawing such segregation.

A three-judge panel of the U.S. Court of Appeals in Washington, D.C., Oct. 9 upheld the licensing of three private power projects that would flood the site of the proposed Hells Canyon dam. The Court refused to upset a Federal Power Commission order licensing three dams proposed by the Idaho Power Co. in the Snake River bordering Idaho and Oregon.

Public power groups had asked the Court to void the license. The Senate July 19 rejected a bill to authorize a federally built high dam in Hells Canyon. (Weekly Report, p. 873)

Eisenhower Meets Press

President Eisenhower Oct. 5 told his 95th news conference he did not regard as entirely wise the constitutional amendment barring a President from serving a third term. By and large, Mr. Eisenhower said, the people should be able to choose as President anybody they want, regardless of the number of terms.

The President also said:

It would be foolish for the United States to stop H-bomb testing until international controls were agreed on.

Extension of the minimum wage to new groups should come ahead of any increase in the current \$1 an hour federal wage floor.

It never had been the intention of his Administration to cut the strength of U.S. armed forces; reductions in manpower had been pegged to introduction of new weapons.

He thought the best way to finance new schools was through 50-50 federal-state matching, with federal money distributed on a basis of need as the first consideration.

* * *

President Eisenhower Oct. 11 told his 96th news conference Republican Sens. Joseph R. McCarthy (Wis.), William E. Jenner (Ind.) and George W. Malone (Nev.) did not agree with him in many things and he could not "look to them for help" in seeking to put over a legislative program "for the good of the country." The President said: "Let's remember, there are no national parties in the United States. There are 48 state parties, then they are the ones that determine the people that belong to those parties. There is nothing I can do to say that no one is not a Republican. The most I can say is that in many things they do not agree with me. Therefore, in looking for help to get over a program, which is the sole purpose of political leadership, as I see it, for the good of the country, I can't look at them, look to them, for help. But there is no -- we have got to remember that these are state organizations, and there is nothing I can do to say so-and-so is Republican and so-and-so is not Republican." The President said he wanted "as many Republicans as I can possibly get going down the line with me because time is short. You find out how short it is sometimes when you are trying to get these things done before the close of a session, and you need all the help you can get; and I am never going to stop trying." (CQ's 84th Congress Eisenhower Support and Opposition scores and Party Unity scores, respectively, for McCarthy, Jenner and Malone: McCarthy, 44, 32, 57; Jenner, 52, 26, 64; Malone, 51, 28, 63.)

The President also said:

He regarded management of America's internal affairs as the paramount issue of the Presidential campaign.

Committee Roundup

In This Section..... (Oct. 5-11)

- Senate Committee Gives Views on Guided Missile
- Senate Unit Questions Jailed Illinois Auditor
- Alleged Sale of Texas Postmasterships Probed
- Phony Telegrams Admitted in Lobby Inquiry
- Democrats, GOP Disclose Campaign Contributions

DISARMAMENT REPORT

COMMITTEE -- Senate Foreign Relations, Disarmament Subcommittee.

ACTION -- Oct. 6 released a staff study on the technical problems of disarmament. (Weekly Report, p. 1110)

The study said that "if any control over long-range ballistic-type missiles is to be achieved, the means of control must be established before these weapons are perfected." Unless "prompt measures" were taken to limit the development of the ICBM, the study said, the country which completed the first successful test "would have a very great and significant advantage over other countries."

In releasing the study, Subcommittee Chairman Hubert H. Humphrey (D Minn.) said there were no technical barriers to agreement on banning nuclear bomb tests. With present methods of detection, he said "any violation...would...be almost instantly known to the world at large."

RELATED DEVELOPMENTS -- Democratic Presidential candidate Adlai E. Stevenson Sept. 29 in Minneapolis and in earlier speeches had proposed a "moratorium" on U.S. testing of hydrogen bombs. President Eisenhower Oct. 6 said he thought it would be "foolish" to stop tests unilaterally without Russian agreement to do the same, adding bomb tests were "an indispensable part of our defense program" and served important research and development purposes.

Sen. Styles Bridges (R N.H.), disarmament Subcommittee member, Oct. 6 said Humphrey's action in releasing the staff study "instead of fostering bipartisanship in foreign policy, in effect, undermines it." He said the other members of the Subcommittee were not consulted on release of the study.

Senate Minority Leader William F. Knowland (R Calif.), also a Subcommittee member, Oct. 7 questioned "the propriety of issuing the staff study which deals with so grave a question as international control of nuclear weapons, in the heat of a political campaign."

HODGE EMBEZZLEMENT

COMMITTEE -- Senate Banking and Currency.

BEGAN HEARINGS -- In Chicago to determine the involvement of federally insured banks in ex-Illinois State Auditor Orville E. Hodge's embezzlement of \$1.5 million of State funds. (Weekly Report, p. 926)

TESTIMONY -- Oct. 8 -- Ralph K. Schlitz, assistant cashier of the Southmoor Bank and Trust Co., said he had cashed large checks for Hodge because they were

approved by ex-Southmoor Bank President Edward A. Hintz. He said he otherwise could have refused to cash them, but "I have loyalty to my superiors." Schlitz said Edward A. Epping, Hodge's administrative assistant, usually was in Hintz' office when the checks were brought out for him to cash. Records of Hodge's cashing of State warrants were kept in a private ledger maintained by Hintz, Schlitz said. The warrants were unusual, he said, because in practically all cases the payees did not have accounts at Southmoor Bank. Schlitz said he would hand the cash to Hintz or put it in a "brown envelope" used to provide cash for any of Hodge's personal checks.

Hodge, now serving a 12-15 year prison term for embezzlement, said he could not explain why he pocketed State money. "I suppose it was temporary insanity," he said.

Hodge said he closed the First State Bank of Elmwood Park in April, 1953, because it held too many small loan notes. Its successor, the Bank of Elmwood Park, in which he purchased stock, was opened seven weeks later, he said. He said he made several trips to Washington, D.C., to get authorization for the bank to open with \$600,000 capital instead of the \$1 million asked by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corp. He said he did not discuss the matter with any members of Congress, or seek White House help, but talked only with FDIC staff members. He said he bought 3,200 shares of stock in the new bank, at \$20 a share, because it was "short of needed capital." Later, Hodge said, he bought 7,000 shares because "by then it was a good investment." The shares were put in an employee's name, he said, because he did not think the state auditor should be identified with the transaction. Organizers of the new bank included ex-Gov. Dwight H. Green of Illinois, currently bank board chairman.

Hodge said he saw nothing wrong in the fact that John Russell, an FDIC official, later became president of the new bank.

Oct. 9 -- Hintz, serving a three-year prison term for conspiracy, refused to testify because "of present circumstances." Committee Chairman J. William Fulbright (D Ark.) said he would recommend that Hintz be cited for contempt.

Epping, serving a five-year term for conspiracy, also refused to testify under the Fifth Amendment and "because of pending indictments."

Fulbright questioned Hodge on what he had done with the stolen cash. Hodge said he had no written documents to show where the funds were spent, but enumerated the following expenditures: \$200,000 on a hotel at Ft. Lauderdale, Fla.; \$75,000 for an interest in a small loan company; \$60,000 on a farm; \$100,000 for airplanes, which he said all had been turned over to the State.

Fulbright said Hodge's testimony left more than \$600,000 unaccounted for. Hodge said "I don't think you're being fair with me." Fulbright replied, "You are lying to this committee."

Hodge also said; he did not share the embezzled cash with anybody; he was not "covering up" for anyone; he was not a target for blackmailers or extortionists; he neither reported nor paid federal income taxes on the State funds he pocketed.

Committee Roundup - 2

Hodge said "everything I and my dear wife had is going to the State," and that "I think it will exceed what I owe."

Oct. 10 -- Henry J. Beutel, who headed the First State Bank of Elmwood Park which Hodge closed, said the bank's closing was "unwarranted. A constructive auditor...could have straightened out our operation," he said. Beutel said he had to make cash contributions from 1949 to 1952 to get State treasury funds for deposit in his bank.

Oct. 11 -- Charles O. Mensik, president of the City Savings Assn., said that in April of 1956 he gave Hodge \$6,800 for "political advertising." He said Hodge told him "\$4,000 would be used to get a good turnout in the primary and the other \$2,800 would go to help legislators who were friendly to savings and loan associations."

POSTAL PROBE

COMMITTEE -- Senate Post Office and Civil Service, Special Subcommittee.

BEGAN HEARINGS -- On alleged selling of Texas postmasterships.

BACKGROUND -- Chairman Olin D. Johnston (D S.C.) Oct. 8 called a special subcommittee into session, said a "variety of serious charges" of "job buying" had been reported, along with charges of "improper influence" on the postal service. He said the charges "have been known to the Administration and the Civil Service Commission for several months," but no action has been taken "to either disprove them or clear up the whole sordid mess." Sen. William Langer (R N.D.), a member of the Subcommittee, Oct. 8 objected to holding hearings before the Nov. 6 elections. He said there would necessarily be political overtones to the inquiry, and that there would not be enough time to present the full facts in the proposed four-day hearings. The Subcommittee, whose third member is Sen. William R. Laird III (D W.Va.), Oct. 9 overrode Langer's objections.

TESTIMONY -- Oct. 9 -- Mrs. Maggie P. Wilder of Sylvester, Texas, said she applied for a postmaster's job early in 1954, and in December received a letter requesting a \$10 contribution for the Republican party from National Committeeman H.J. Porter of Houston. She said, "I thought it was just for the cost of processing the papers" for the postmastership and had no thought that it was "buying a job." The letter, placed in the record, said in part, "As you are probably aware, our state headquarters, which processes all of the appointments to federal positions in Texas, must be supported by contributions." Mrs. Wilder said she was rated third among the applicants by the Civil Service Commission and did not get the job.

Mrs. Clara K. Childs of Bluegrove, Texas, said she contributed \$125 to the GOP in 1954 in response to a letter from Porter, and "actually thought it was going to processing of my appointment" as postmistress. She said she had been appointed acting postmistress in 1953, but was replaced in 1955.

S. Lester Hansard Jr. of Wichita Falls, Texas, ex-Clay County Republican chairman, said James Q. Pennington sought him out at home and in a bowling alley and offered to write a check to assure his getting a postmaster's job. Pennington succeeded Mrs. Childs in the Bluegrove postmastership. Hansard said he refused Pennington's offer.

Pennington said he had never been to Hansard's home, and that he only sought his endorsement at the bowling alley, but did not offer Hansard a check.

The conflicting testimony led Subcommittee Counsel J. Don Kerlin to recommend that the witnesses' statements be sent to the Justice Department for possible perjury action.

Oct. 11 -- Robert C. Carraway Jr. of Dallas, assistant to the Southwest regional director of the postal service, said he had contributed \$100 to GOP campaign funds on his own initiative and could not recall being approached either verbally or in writing for a contribution. He said he got his present job through Porter's support.

Mrs. Bennie May Carraway, Carraway's divorced wife, said Carraway had received a letter requesting a contribution from Texas GOP leaders in 1954.

RELATED DEVELOPMENTS -- Oct. 10 -- Porter said the letters written to Mrs. Wilder and Mrs. Childs were "routine" solicitations for party funds.

CORRUPT PRACTICES PROBE

COMMITTEE -- Special Senate Committee to Investigate Political Activities, Lobbying and Corrupt Practices.

RESUMED HEARINGS -- On the activities of persons and organizations in connection with the vetoed bill (HR 6645) to exempt independent producers of natural gas from federal public utility rate control and other lobby activity. (Weekly Report, p. 1111)

TESTIMONY -- Oct. 8 -- Albert H. Stoddard, sales manager for the Jack C. O'Conner Insurance Agency of Boston, said he assumed "full responsibility" for sending telegrams -- some unauthorized -- to Massachusetts Senators John F. Kennedy (D) and Leverett Saltonstall (R) urging defeat of legislation to broaden social security benefits.

Stoddard said he sent 160 telegrams using names of different individuals acting "on his own" after he determined that the bill would be financially detrimental to his agency. He said he did not confer with O'Conner on his decision to send the telegrams.

Francis Burke, a part-time agent for the O'Conner firm, said he did not authorize the signing of his name to the wire. He said "the wire in no way reflected my attitude toward the legislation. I had hoped it would become law."

Mrs. Grace M. Dahl of Alston, Mass., said she did not authorize the use of her name. She said she favored the legislation.

Donald Brown, an O'Conner agent, said his name was used without his permission, but that he agreed with the sentiments of the telegram.

Oct. 9 -- Paxton Howard, a Shell Oil Co. attorney, said he got a \$5,000 bonus for his efforts in behalf of the natural gas bill but did not register as a lobbyist. He said William Kenney, vice president of Shell, sent him to Alabama to counter an "opposition" group. Howard said he later came to Washington to be "available to talk to anybody who would listen," but he did not consider this lobbying activity. He said his "listeners" included three Senators.

Maston Nixon, chairman of the General Gas Committee, said his Committee did not lobby during consideration of the natural gas bill. Chairman John L. McClellan (D Ark.) recalled Nixon who had been the leadoff witness last May 1 because of what he termed "serious

conflict" in Nixon's testimony. (Weekly Report, p. 505)

Nixon said his committee distributed information urging passage of the bill but that persons representing the committee did not "buttonhole Senators." He said "the point of difference" over whether the GGC engaged in lobbying was in the conception of what lobbying is.

Oct. 10 -- Gregory Prince and Patrick H. Matthews of the Assn. of American Railroads said AAR spent \$900 in tickets to a Democratic fund-raising dinner and \$500 for a similar Republican dinner during the 84th Congress. Matthews said he was not "pressured" into buying the tickets but was "solicited." He said the tickets were not bought "to influence legislation."

Representatives of the National Milk Producers Federation and the American Trucking Assns. said their organizations made no direct campaign contributions.

Clyde T. Ellis, executive director of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Assn., said private power companies should be required to charge the cost of "propaganda" campaigns against profits. Ellis said "we believe it is basically and fundamentally wrong for giant monopolies to be able to saddle millions of dollars annually in cost-plus advertising propaganda and direct and indirect lobbying costs onto helpless rate payers."

Ellis said his organization had made no contributions to the funds of any political party nor had it made any funds available to help any particular candidate.

McClellan adjourned the hearings subject to his call.

RELATED DEVELOPMENTS -- Oct. 10 -- McClellan said the Committee had almost completed its investigation of lobbying. He said there has been a dearth of information from the Eisenhower Administration, the public, the press and from fellow Senators. Although some limited future hearings are in prospect, he said, what's left in the \$300,000 inquiry fund is mainly to "find out the weaknesses and try to develop a better law" on lobbying.

McClellan said the Committee would take a post-election look at political activities of both unions and corporations. He said the Committee would be interested in political activity where contributions to a candidate's campaign fund was made with strings attached.

CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS

COMMITTEE -- Senate Rules and Administration, Privileges and Elections Subcommittee.

BEGAN HEARINGS -- On campaign contributions and expenditures. (1953 Almanac, p. 40; 1955 Almanac, p. 722)

TESTIMONY -- Oct. 8 -- Professor Alexander Heard of the University of North Carolina, who has made an extensive investigation of campaign costs, said about \$140 million was spent on 1952 campaigning. He predicted the total would be much higher in 1956. He said although direct campaign contributions from corporations and unions were banned, large amounts of money were made available indirectly from those sources. He said "various techniques" used including buying of large blocs of tickets to campaign fund dinners, providing stamps and free printing, furnishing free office space and equipment and providing "free rides" on airplanes. He produced charts showing that most of the 1952 contributions ranging from \$500 to more than \$10,000 went to Republicans except for funds reported by labor groups.

Robert R. Nathan of Americans for Democratic Action urged a change in the law to require that the radio-televi-

vision industry "make a reasonable amount of free time available to candidates of the major parties" because the "tens of millions of dollars paid to the radio-television industry for...campaigning is an unconscionable and indefensible levy on the American voter."

Subcommittee Chairman Albert Gore (D Tenn.) said a staff tabulation showed that Republicans have spent \$411,651 to date and have contracted for an additional \$1,489,668 of radio-television time while the Democrats have spent \$384,617 and have contracted for additional time costing \$690,026.

Subcommittee Member Thomas B. Curtis (R Neb.) said dues collected from labor union members "in order to hold their jobs" were being spent on political campaigns "in violation of the law."

Oct. 9 -- Walter Reuther, AFL-CIO vice president and UAW president, said all contributions to candidates from the UAW and from the AFL-CIO Committee on Political Education came from "the voluntary contributions of union members and other individuals, not out of moneys collected through regular union dues or assessments." He reported that through Sept. 30, the UAW had received from its locals \$145,152.17 from \$1 contributions which he said totaled \$194,070.97. He said the remaining \$48,918.80 was kept by local unions or sent to state and county councils. He said donations from his union's members totaled "considerably less than the contributions made to the Republican party...in 1952" by the Pews, the Rockefellers, the Mellons and the DuPonts. He said their political gifts aggregated \$259,275 in the 1952 campaign.

Oct. 10 -- Asst. Attorney General Warren Olney III said the Justice Department was investigating a complaint from Chicago alleging both state and national banks in that city had made substantial contributions "for a political purpose."

Olney said thousands of qualified Negro citizens in Louisiana were being denied their legal right to vote in this year's election because white citizens councils took them off the official election lists.

Attorney General Herbert Brownell had asked Congress for legislation to allow federal court injunctions to protect the rights of voters in such cases, but such legislation, passed by the House, was "bottled up in the Senate Judiciary Committee."

Democratic National Chairman Paul M. Butler said the Republicans were exerting "tremendous pressure" on business to collect campaign funds in 1956. Butler cited a letter he said William F. Keady, president of Fibre-Board Products Inc., San Francisco, had written to his employees Aug. 6. Butler said "he not only reminds them they have 'an economic reason' for contributing to the Republican party, but...asks them to send him a memorandum of how much they contribute."

Republican National Chairman Leonard W. Hall said, "We feel that when a party has the respect of the people they can get the money."

RELATED DEVELOPMENT -- Questionnaires on campaign contributions submitted to the Republican and Democratic National Committees by the Subcommittee showed:

Democrats -- September receipts, \$582,047; expenditures, \$602,808. Bank balance at month's end, \$14,894; unpaid bills, \$120,665.

Republicans -- September receipts, \$244,587; expenditures, \$368,923. Bank balance at month's end, \$540,289; unpaid bills \$24,000.

Campaign Funds

Hugh Roy Cullen, Houston, Texas, oil millionaire, was listed as the biggest 1952 political campaign contributor by a political scientist who testified before the Senate subcommittee investigating campaign finances. Cullen put up \$53,000 in 1952 -- \$39,000 for Republicans and another \$14,000 split among five Democratic candidates, according to a check of contributions made by Alexander Heard, political science professor at the University of North Carolina.

Heard gave the Subcommittee a list of 109 campaign contributions of \$10,000 or more. He said the list may not be complete because official reports from which it was compiled are not always accurate. He said the large contributors supplied \$1,892,869, of which \$1,192,614 went to Republicans and \$700,255 to Democrats.

Second on the list were Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Newton Pew Jr. of Philadelphia, who gave \$45,570 to the Republicans. Several large contributors split their gifts among the parties. Publisher Henry R. Luce and his wife, Clare Boothe Luce, Ambassador to Italy, were listed for \$28,000 to Republicans and \$500 to Democratic Sen. Symington of Missouri. Mr. and Mrs. Donaldson Brown of Port Deposit, Md., were listed for \$31,500 to Republicans and \$3,000 to Sen. Byrd (D Va.)

Other contributions listed by Heard:

Archibald and Jean S. Alexander (he was a candidate), Bernardsville, N.J., \$19,090 (of which \$4,090 was by loan), Democratic. Frank and Helen G. Altschul, New York City and Stamford, Conn., \$14,058.74, Democratic; \$2,500 Republican (Sen. Smith, Eisenhower nomination).

Mr. and Mrs. Max Ascoli, New York and Stamford, Conn., \$17,200 Democratic; \$500 Republican (Eisenhower nomination).

Mr. and Mrs. Sewell Avery, Chicago, \$10,000 Republican. Former Sen. William Benton, Connecticut, \$15,033.48, Democratic.

William A. Blakely, Dallas, \$16,000, Democratic. Mr. and Mrs. Jacob Blaustein, Baltimore, \$13,000, Democratic. Mrs. Dudley S. Blossom, Mrs. Elizabeth B. Blossom, Cleveland, \$10,000, Republican.

George T. Bowdoin, New York, \$10,000, Republican. Louis H. Boyar, Mrs. Rachel Boyar, Beverly Hills, Calif., \$11,250, Democratic.

A.M. Bruce, New York, \$10,000, Democratic. Paul and Polly Chase, New York, \$10,000, Democratic. James P. Clark, Philadelphia, \$10,000, Democratic. Mr. and Mrs. W.R. Coe, New York, \$17,883.50, Republican. Mr. and Mrs. Lamont Dupont Copeland, Wilmington, Del., \$10,800, Republican.

E.L. Cord, Nevada, \$36,500, Republican. Mr. and Mrs. Richard Deutsch, Greenwich, Conn., \$10,700, Democratic.

Mr. and Mrs. Clarence D. Dillon, New York, \$23,000, Republican. John J. and Georgean Dowdle, New York, \$10,000, Democratic. Angier B. Duke, New York, \$11,500, Democratic. Irene Dupont, Wilmington, Del., \$24,315, Republican. Pierre Samuel Dupont 3rd, Wilmington, Del., \$11,500, Republican. Harry B. Earhart, Ann Arbor, Mich., \$11,000, Republican. William C. Feazel, Shreveport, La., \$10,000, Democratic. A.L. Fergenson, Larchmont, N.Y., \$11,100, Democratic. Marshall and Ruth Field, New York, \$28,000, Democratic. Jacob France, Baltimore, \$13,000, Republican. Helen Clay Frick, Pittsburgh, \$20,000, Republican. Walter and Dorothy Gramm, Winnetka, Ill., \$10,000, Democratic. Mr. and Mrs. Edward H. Green Sr., New York, \$12,000, Republican.

Albert M. Greenfield, Philadelphia, \$26,000, Democratic. Reuben and Ethel Gryszmish, Boston, \$10,500, Democratic. Harry F. Guggenheim, New York, \$12,000, Republican. M. Robert Guggenheim, Washington, D.C., \$22,000, Republican. Harry and Mary Haskell, Wilmington, Del., \$22,500, Republican. L.A. and L.M. Harvey, Los Angeles, \$10,000, Democratic. James N.B. and J.W. Hill, Boston, \$15,500, Republican. E. Roland Harriman, New York, \$22,000, Republican. W.A. and Mrs. Harriman, New York, \$14,500, Democratic. Mr. and Mrs. H.L. Hunt, Dallas, \$38,300, Republican. Mr. and Mrs. Henry Ittleson Jr., New York, \$16,000, Republican. Jack and Alice Kaplan, New York, \$19,000, Democratic. Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Katz, Baltimore, \$10,000, Democratic. Paul Kayser, Houston, \$9,000, Republican; \$1,000, Democratic (Sen. Daniel).

Francis E. Kelly, Dorchester, Mass., \$11,200, Democratic. Mr. and Mrs. Joseph P. Kennedy, Palm Beach, \$14,000, Democratic.

Mrs. Mary W. Lasker, New York, \$21,000, Democratic. Herbert H. Lehman, New York, \$12,250, Democratic. Mr. and Mrs. Eugene Leone, New York, \$10,000, Republican (of which \$1,600 refunded).

David M. and Adele R. Levy, New York, \$17,000, Democratic. Marjorie and Benjamin Lindheimer, Chicago, \$10,000, Democratic.

Louis A. Lotito, New York, \$10,000, Democratic. Douglas B. Marshall, Houston, \$12,750, Republican. Mr. and Mrs. Jeremiah Milbank, New York, \$12,000, Republican. Sylvia and Lester Martin, New York, \$18,100, Democratic. Thomas B. McCabe, Chester, Pa., \$13,000, Republican. Matthew and Ruth McClosky, Philadelphia, \$19,000, Democratic. Mr. and Mrs. Paul Mellon, Pittsburgh, \$22,000, Republican. Mr. and Mrs. Richard K. Mellon, Pittsburgh, \$26,500, Republican (\$1,000 refunded).

Charles E. Merrill, New York, \$16,000, Republican. Col. Francis P. Miller (a candidate), Charlottesville, Va., \$23,148.69, Democratic.

Douglas M. Moffatt, New York, \$15,000, Republican. Edward E. Moore, Osterville, Mass., \$10,000, Democratic. Marie C. Morrissey, New York, \$11,500, Democratic. Mr. and Mrs. Harvey S. Mudd, Beverly Hills, Calif., \$10,000, Republican.

E.H. Munson, Babylon, N.Y., \$10,000, Republican. Wm. M. and Mabel Pew Myrin, Philadelphia, \$35,500, Republican. Mr. and Mrs. G.J. Guthrie Nicholson, Portsmouth, R.I., \$13,000, Republican.

Alexander and Evelyn O'Connor, Bayonne, N.J., \$10,750, Democratic.

Mr. and Mrs. Hubert Olive (a candidate), Lexington, N.C., \$14,000, Democratic.

Wallace and Elizabeth Oilman, Evanston, Ill., \$10,000, Democratic.

Dwight R.G. Palmer, New York, \$29,050, Democratic (of which \$11,000 was by loan).

R.C. Patterson Jr., New York, \$10,000, Democratic. Arthur and Julia Pew, Philadelphia, \$10,200, Republican. Mr. and Mrs. J. Howard Pew, Philadelphia, \$38,250, Republican. Miss Mary Ethyl Pew, Philadelphia, \$36,250, Republican. Lawrence C. Phipps, Denver, Colo., \$10,000, Republican. Mr. and Mrs. John T. Pratt Jr., New York, \$10,000, Republican. Mrs. E.P. Prentice, New York, \$11,500, Republican. Richard S. Reynolds, Richmond, Va., \$14,500, Democratic. Mr. and Mrs. David Rockefeller, New York, \$20,000, Republican. Mr. and Mrs. John D. Rockefeller Jr., New York, \$34,500, Republican.

Mr. and Mrs. John D. Rockefeller III, New York, \$14,000, Republican.

Mr. and Mrs. Laurence S. Rockefeller, New York, \$35,000, Republican.

Mr. and Mrs. Nelson Rockefeller, New York, \$32,000, Republican. Winthrop Rockefeller, New York, \$15,000, Republican. Mr. and Mrs. A.M. Scaife, Pittsburgh, \$22,500, Republican.

Mr. and Mrs. John M. Schiff, New York, \$15,000, Republican. D.D. Shepard, Washington, D.C., \$23,000, Republican.

Mr. and Mrs. Alfred P. Sloan Jr., \$25,000, Republican. Frank Small Jr., Clinton, Md., \$18,551.31, Republican.

H. Alexander Smith (a candidate), Princeton, N.J., \$10,000, Republican.

William A. Smith, Houston, \$10,000, Republican. Mr. and Mrs. Roger Stevens, New York, \$13,000, Democratic (of which \$2,000 was by loan).

Anne and Dewey Stone, Brockton, Mass., \$14,825, Democratic. Mark S. Taper, Beverly Hills, Calif., \$15,000, Democratic. Mr. and Mrs. Loyd P. Tate, Pinehurst, N.C., \$10,000, Republican. Wade V. Thompson (Jr. & Sr.), Nashville, Tenn., \$23,000, Democratic.

Millard E. Tydings, Washington, D.C., \$10,500, Democratic. Dorothy and Peter Vredenburg, 3rd, Birmingham, Ala., \$10,000, Democratic.

Frank J. Waters, Los Angeles, \$10,000, Republican; \$3,000, Democratic (St. Louis City campaign Committee).

Ben and Stella Weingert, Los Angeles, \$10,000, Democratic. Mr. and Mrs. E.T. Weir, Pittsburgh, \$27,665, Republican.

Mr. and Mrs. John Hay Whitney, New York, \$31,000, Republican.

ALASKA ELECTION

In returns from 161 of 271 precincts, Democrats won or led in races for 30 of 39 territorial offices and legislative seats in Alaska's Oct. 9 general election. Incumbent Delegate of Congress E.L. Bartlett (D) defeated Byron Gillam, former Fairbanks merchant by 13,617 to 6,727 votes, according to incomplete returns.

Democrats held leads for 21 territorial house seats to the Republicans' three. For territorial senate seats, Republicans led for five to the Democrats' four. The Democrats were assured control of the senate as well as the house because of seven holdover senators. The Republicans had no holdovers.

Democrats led in territory-wide races for two U.S. "Senators" and a "Representative" to go to Congress in behalf of statehood. Officially Alaska has no seats in Congress, but acted under the Tennessee Plan in balloting. Tennessee was admitted to the Union in 1796 after holding unauthorized elections and sending members to Congress. Congress decided that because of the action Tennessee was ready for statehood. Incomplete returns showed: the vote for "Senator" for a six-year term -- former Gov. Ernest Gruening (D) led Territorial Sen. John Butrovich (R), 6,357 to 6,197; for four-year term -- Territorial Sen. William Egan (D) of Valdez led publisher Robert Atwood (R) of Anchorage, 6,010 to 5,259; for "Representative" -- Territorial Sen. Ralph Rivers (D) of Fairbanks led Charles Burdick (R) of Juneau, 6,957 to 5,291.

Of major interest was Alaska's election history of accurately predicting national Congressional trends. In 1952, Alaskans elected Republicans to 21 of 24 house seats and in six of nine territorial senate races. In 1954, 21 Democrats and three Republicans were elected to the house, nine Democrats and no Republicans to the senate.

H-BOMB TESTS

Former President Harry S. Truman Oct. 6 said he advocated continuing all tests necessary to find out the power and use of the atom. Adlai E. Stevenson, Democratic Presidential nominee, had urged that the United States take the lead in seeking an agreement to ban H-bomb tests. Truman defended Stevenson's view, said Stevenson was not proposing a unilateral banning of H-bomb tests, "for such a course would be suicidal without proper international safety." (Weekly Report, p. 1203ff)

State Roundup

CALIFORNIA -- State Treasurer Charles G. Johnson Oct. 3 announced his resignation due to ill health. The Republican official was under investigation by the Legislative Budget Committee which was given documents in July purporting to show Johnson had personally borrowed and had not repaid approximately \$40,000 from banks in which he deposited state money.

HAWAII -- Elizabeth P. Farrington, Republican Delegate to Congress, Oct. 6 won renomination in Hawaii's primary election. John A. Burns won the Democratic nomination.

MAINE -- First Congressional District election ballot inspection Oct. 10 showed 766 challenged ballots of 16,550 checked. The inspection resulted from the Sept. 10 election results, in which incumbent Rep. Robert Hale (R) defeated James C. Oliver (D) by a 29-vote margin, out of 116,028 ballots cast. Nearly all of the questioned votes were absentee ballots. Basis of the objections was failure of city and town clerks to accompany the absentee ballots with the original applications for them and the signed and notarized envelopes in which voters returned them, as prescribed by Maine law. (Weekly Report, p. 1107)

MISSOURI -- Fred H. Kiburz, St. Louis County highway engineer, Oct. 5 said employees in his office contributed 1 1/2 percent of their salary each month to a fund, a substantial part of which was used for Republican political purposes. Kiburz said the fund, also used for charitable purposes, brought in about \$7,500 a year. Kiburz, in office for eight years, said when the Republicans took over the highway engineer's department in the county from the Democrats in 1940, they found records indicating the Democrats had a balance of \$12,000 in a similar fund.

NEW JERSEY -- Republican State Chairman Samuel L. Bodine Oct. 4 announced formation of a New Jersey Republican Truth Squad composed of Reps. William B. Widnall, Peter Frelinghuysen Jr. and state assemblyman Alfred Beadleston.

NEW YORK -- The Socialist Labor party Oct. 5 was ruled off the state ballot for the November election. Barnett V. Nova, executive deputy secretary of state said the party got the 12,000 signatures required to place it on the ballot but failed in 11 counties to get the 50 signatures required from each county.

Peter J. Hawley, New York state chairman of the American Labor party, Oct. 7 announced the state committee had unanimously approved a resolution dissolving the organization. In 1954, the New York ALP gubernatorial candidate, John P. McManus, received 46,886 votes. The election law required a party to poll 50,000 votes to retain status as a legal party.

OHIO -- Robert S. Cox, Fourth District Congressional candidate, Oct. 3 died of complications following a cold. Cox was opposing the re-election of Rep. William McCulloch (R).

UTAH -- Lamont Toronto, Utah secretary of state, Oct. 6 said Gov. J. Bracken Lee would be listed on the November ballot as a candidate for re-election. Toronto said his office had accepted a nominating petition for Lee with about 450 signatures. Lee was defeated for the Republican nomination by George D. Clyde in the Sept. 11 primary. (Weekly Report, p. 1108)

1956 Campaign Statements

Congressional Quarterly will reprint major speeches and statements of Presidential and Vice Presidential candidates and campaign leaders during the 1956 Presidential campaign.

REPUBLICANS

These are the major statements of Republican campaigners for the week ending Oct. 10:

DWIGHT EISENHOWER

Following is the complete text of an Oct. 5 statement by President Eisenhower on his Administration's policies regarding the testing of hydrogen bombs:

The American government's policy with respect to the testing of large-scale nuclear weapons has been made an issue in the current political campaign.

I regret this fact. The manner in which the issue has been raised can lead only to confusion at home and misunderstanding abroad. There is no subject more difficult than this to discuss before an audience of the whole world -- which must include those hostile to us. There is no subject on which the American people should have so united an understanding, free of confusion or partisan differences.

I speak as President, charged under the Constitution with responsibility for the defense and security of our nation. I therefore must point out the following essentials in our national policy.

1. The testing of atomic weapons to date has been -- and continues -- an indispensable part of our defense program. The development of these weapons has been a major, if not decisive, deterrent to Communist aggression in past years. And the importance of our strength in this particular field is sharply emphasized by the Communist world's numerical superiority in manpower.

2. As part of a general disarmament program, the American government, at the same time, has consistently affirmed and reaffirmed its readiness -- indeed, its strong will -- to restrict and control both the testing and the use of nuclear weapons under specific and supervised international disarmament agreement. This fact is known to every government in the world. It can scarcely be unknown to any informed American citizen.

3. In terms of our national weapons policy, it is the responsibility of specific officials of the government -- notably the Atomic Energy Commission, the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the President -- to weigh, at all times, the proper emphasis on various types and sizes of weapons, their testing and development. Such emphasis is necessarily subject to constant review and re-examination. This specific matter is manifestly not a subject for detailed public discussion -- for obvious security reasons.

In the light of this national policy, I must address myself to certain proposals that have been made over a period of months.

1. There has been more than one proposal made. These proposals have differed. These differences themselves have caused confusion. On April 21, it was proposed that we give "prompt and earnest attention to stopping further tests of the hydrogen bomb." This was so explicitly to be a one-sided American action that the suggestion was added that, if other nations failed to do likewise, "we can reconsider our policy." On Sept. 5, reference was made to "my proposal last spring to halt further testing of large nuclear devices, conditioned upon adherence by the other atomic powers to a similar policy." On Sept. 20, a new verbal formula urged this country to "take the lead in promoting curtailment by all nations of hydrogen bomb tests."

2. The unwisdom of such action, without proper international safeguards, was quickly emphasized by the Democratic Chairman of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, Senator Clinton Anderson. He said: "There is no indication that Russia would stop their tests. Under the circumstances, I do not believe we could call off ours." The testimony of such a responsible

Democrat makes clear that this is not -- as it should not be -- a partisan political issue, but an issue raised by one individual.

3. The proposals clearly take no account of what would be the result of stopping our tests. Tests of large weapons, by any nation, may be detected when they occur. But any such test follows many months of research and preparation. This means that elaborate tests could be prepared by another nation without our knowledge. By the time we had such knowledge, our present commanding lead in the field of nuclear weapons could be reduced or even overtaken. Thus our power to guard the peace would be weakened.

4. The proposals made ignore some essential reasons of these tests.

(a) Our most recent tests have been those that have helped us to know how to make -- not primarily weapons for vaster destruction -- but weapons for defense of our cities against enemy air attack.

(b) As one important result of our latest tests, we have learned to make weapons which reduce fall-out to a minimum and whose destructive effect can be concentrated upon military objectives.

5. In the verbal confusion surrounding these proposals, an attempt has been made to cite, as having made "similar proposals," great world figures, even including his holiness, Pope Pius XII. All these men -- like this government, like all responsible and thoughtful leaders in the free world, statesmen or churchmen -- are sincerely anxious for international agreement allowing effective control of all armaments, nuclear or conventional.

The Pope in his last Christmas message to the world urged "a check on experiments in nuclear weapons by means of an international agreement." He stated that the matter involved "a question of three steps -- renunciation of experimentation with atomic weapons, renunciation of the use of such, and general control of armaments." And he called for the "sum total of those three precautions."

6. Within the past week, yet another proposition has been advanced. This proposition denounced the government's "insistence" on "perfect" or "fool-proof" supervision of disarmament as a "danger" in periling any possible international agreement.

I must solemnly disagree. I shall continue this insistence for however long I am charged with chief responsibility for the security of our nation. The danger lies in exactly the opposite direction. It lies in the direction of the vain hope that something less than secure safeguards could justify any curtailment of our power to defend ourselves, our allies, and the free world. Finally: I reaffirm the steadfast intention of this government to continue striving ceaselessly to ease the burden of arms upon not just a few nations, but upon all the peoples of the world.

President's Draft Statement

Following is the complete text of an Oct. 6 statement by President Eisenhower on his Administration's draft policies:

The recurring political talk about a possible early ending of the draft is, I believe, hurtful to America's security interests throughout the world. All America longs for a peaceful world based on justice in which the need for great armaments will no longer exist. But the cause of world peace and of confidence and tranquility at home is not furthered by suggestions, the effect of which would be greatly to weaken our defenses.

The power of the United States is mainly what holds the world from general war, as we move continuously toward the objective of all true Americans: a just and enduring peace. We must not be deceived when Communist power adopts a new and smiling tactic. There is no change in its fixed determination to dominate the world. This Administration intends to protect the freedom of our people with a national security establishment of adequate strength and appropriate composition.

For 20 years or more our Government alternated between costly peaks in years of military crisis and starving valleys in years of apparent calm. Twice in this generation relaxations of

America's military strength have been followed by costly wars. Now, since 1953, we have once more gained freedom from armed conflict. We must not let down our guard again. We must not by weakness invite another war. No man can foretell the duration of this need; no matter how earnestly we strive for peace based upon mutual confidence, the circumstances of today's world require strength to avoid war.

Therefore this Administration's program for national security provides for enduring and supportable military strength. Today the United States has about 2,800,000 men in uniform. For an armed force in excess of 1,500,000 men, experience shows that Selective Service is indispensable. The draft does more than fill up our armed strength by calling men into service. The very existence of the draft law so stimulates voluntary enlistment that, for some of the services, draft calls are reduced or non-existent. The constant effort in the Defense Department is to reduce the number of men in service, without damaging the nation's security. Such reduction cannot be achieved merely by tampering with the draft law.

The first requirement is to take every advantage of new advances in the technology of modern arms. That is what this Administration has done and is doing. We use rapid increases in firepower and in the speed of its delivery to replace numbers of men. We cut the strength of administrative activities in favor of combat duties. We incorporate the whole family of guided missiles and atomic weapons in our military planning and overall defense. In this way, we have produced the finest and most powerful military forces in our peacetime history. Actually, since the close of the Korean war, we have reduced military manpower by 20 percent -- 700,000 men. We have also returned 150,000 civilians employed by the military to civilian work.

DRAFT CALLS CUT

For such reasons, we have been able to reduce Selective Service calls from the 523,000-a-year rate when we first took office to 136,000 in the current year. This Administration has established many new choices of military and Reserve service. With all of these choices, no young man has to wait for the draft to plan his future. We do not propose to draft one man more than we need. This Administration has successfully pressed for major legislation to increase voluntary enlistments and the re-enlistment of men already trained and to keep down monthly draft calls. This legislation has increased the pay and benefits of service men, improved the Survivors Benefits Act, covered the armed forces under Social Security, improved service housing, increased hospitalization benefits for service families and in other ways made service life more rewarding.

The result has been to increase re-enlistments, so necessary to our sustained strength, from 24 percent in 1953 to over 43 percent in 1956. Three-fourths of the re-enlistments were for the long six-year term. Our country's good times have complicated the military manpower problem. Today we have the greatest prosperity and the highest level of employment in our history. This very economic health competes with the armed forces for volunteers.

We are doing our best to build a Ready Reserve that will be strong and effective, not just a paper force. We seek to build this strong Reserve as a needed supplement to our standing forces and as a means to hold our active duty strength at reasonable levels. And this I have emphasized before: I am determined that through a strong Reserve we relieve veterans from being recalled to duty in time of emergency while younger men who have not served stay at home. Selective Service is an essential stimulant for building up the necessary Reserve strength.

The free world looks to the United States for leadership in standing firm against the Communist push. We must not now betray that leadership by loose talk of soon ending the draft. The world can only construe that as letting down our guard. To call the draft wasteful and to term it a Maginot Line evidences either ignorance of our military needs or a willingness to take a chance with our nation's security.

The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the military Chiefs of the Services, our greatest experts in these matters, have specifically supported the need for continuing the draft law.

The United States is maintaining its military strength to safeguard the American people in their homes, to deter hostile attack at home and abroad and to encourage the prospect of world peace. This Administration is determined to continue that strength.

Pittsburgh Speech

Following is a partial text of an Oct. 9 speech by President Eisenhower at Pittsburgh, Pa., in which he attacked Democratic campaign proposals:

I am here tonight to do some plain talking. There is one thing that is not an issue in this campaign. It is this: The longing of all Americans for peace, prosperity and progress. No one in this country -- of any political party -- is against peace. No one is against prosperity -- or progress. What then is the real issue? It is this: What principles -- what policies and programs -- can best help our people to gain and to guard these blessings?

How shall we debate this issue? I do it with this conviction: What matters in a democracy is not how loudly our leaders speak -- but how responsibly...not how big their promises are -- but how honest. And I -- for one -- am tired of too much talk about "high roads" and "low roads." There is only one road worthy of American intelligence -- and that is the road of truth.

Our great concerns, obviously, are: the prosperity of our nation, the progress of our people, the peace of the world. And our prayer, as a people, is that we may know these blessings -- all at the same time. For a whole generation, this has rarely been true.

In the 1930's, we knew peace -- a troubled peace -- but few of us knew prosperity: so there could be little progress. In the 1940's most of us knew prosperity -- but there was little peace: so again our progress stalled. And no sooner was Nazi-ism destroyed -- than Communist aggression was on the march. Now, after the events of the last four years, I believe a new hope rises in all of us: We can, in the years just ahead, know the blessings of peace and prosperity and progress at the same time. But one thing is plain: It will not come by happy accident or lucky coincidence. It can only come by firm and true principles and policies -- by hard work -- and, as the times may demand it, by sacrifice.

The record of this Administration is now before the American people. It consists of almost four years of clear accomplishments. There is also before the people a second record -- the record of what our political opponents have been saying over these recent weeks.

ANTITRUST ENFORCEMENT

They say that your government cares only for "big business" -- nothing for "small business." What are the facts? The fact -- the testing fact -- is that the enforcement of antitrust laws has never been more strict and effective than in these last four years. In the year 1955, a total of 54 new antitrust actions were begun by your government. The fact is that we -- not they -- created the Small Business Administration as an independent peacetime agency of government. The fact is that the share of defense contracts going to small business during the last three fiscal years has been well above the three preceding years.

They say that your government has done nothing to check inflation. What are the facts? The cost of living soared almost 50 percent in the last seven years of their Administration -- and it has risen less than 3 percent under this Administration. With the record of this contrast before the people -- I should think that the opposition would be the last ones to talk about inflation.

They say that your government has ignored our children's need for education. What are the facts? Not once but twice, in my State of the Union messages -- in 1955 and again in 1956 -- I urged swift action by Congress. It is also a fact that for the first time in our history the federal government called a great assembly of educators from all the nation to help develop a school program; the plan I submitted to Congress reflected their wisdom and experience. That five-year program was rejected by the opposition. I refuse to repeat anything so extravagant as the opposition's implied charge that one party in this country is for education, another against it. But one fact is quite clear and simple: this

Administration urged action -- and the opposition controlling the Congress produced nothing. Now I propose to urge the next Congress to get this job done -- not in five -- but in four years.

Next -- in their political oratory -- we find a whole series of curious statements falsely implying that this Administration cares nothing for the man they rather patronizingly call "the little fellow." They say your government is indifferent to labor. They say your government is negligent in social security, indifferent to the unemployed. This amounts to saying that your government has no interest in the people of America. This amounts to the charge that your government has betrayed your trust. Such talk is political irresponsibility at its worst.

Now the facts. Labor's share in our national income today is 70 cents out of every dollar -- a record high for the last 20 years. Labor unions have grown to their greatest strength -- and won the best contracts -- in all the history of American labor. Social security has been extended to include 10 million more workers. Federal programs to advance the health of the American people have been expanded and improved as never before in our history. Unemployment insurance has been extended to 4,000,000 more workers -- and its benefits increased by the states -- at our urging -- for many more millions. The unemployment rate this September -- this very last month -- is lower than in any previous peacetime September, during all their 20 years in office. Finally: these political orators promise bigger government spending on every front -- lower taxes for every citizen -- all wrapped up in the bright package of a balanced national budget.

They deplore temporary unemployment in our automobile industry -- as do we all. But -- in almost the same breath -- they deplore installment-credit-buying that is vital to provide jobs in that industry. Now these contradictions inspire one comment. Many people have said -- and I agree -- that this Administration marches politically in the "middle of the road." Obviously, any political opposition has a natural right to try to pass on this road -- by going either to the right or to the left. But there is one thing that is not natural, for the simple reason that it is not possible -- and that is to try to pass on both sides at the same time.

ADMINISTRATION RECORD

I now turn -- with relief -- from the record of this clattering campaign oratory -- to the record of this Administration -- and to the progress of our country. How and why has the number of civilian jobs increased since 1952 at a rate twice the pace of the preceding four years? It has not been done by fabulous Federal spending -- for spending has been cut by billions. It has been done by encouraging the skills of American labor and the power of American industry -- to enrich the lives, not of a favored few, but of all Americans.

How and why have we been able to check the rise in the cost of living? It has been done by applying sense and thrift and discipline to our costs and our fiscal policies. This is the very foundation of a sound dollar. And a sound dollar is vital -- not for the rich, who may afford the loss of inflation -- but for every citizen looking ahead to social security payments -- in sound dollars.

How and why have we been able -- in other ways -- to help labor toward such great progress and strength? It has not been done by using government power as a substitute for good faith in labor-management relations -- as when the previous Administration tried to take over the steel industry in 1952. It has been done by respecting free collective bargaining -- and the men who do the bargaining.

How and why have we been able to help the American economy to smash all records with an annual production rate well above 400 billion dollars -- surging toward a level that soon will provide 70 million jobs? It has been by bringing integrity to our national economic policies -- and by decentralizing the political power of the federal government. These actions have inspired confidence in our future. And this confidence, in turn, has inspired investment in that future.

Now these few examples make one thing clear. There is a basic conflict between our policies and those of the opposition.

They stand for: bigger government costs and spending beyond revenue -- therefore, loose handling of the dollar -- therefore, inflation -- and, inevitably, centralized federal power. We stand

for: economy in government -- stabilized living cost -- and the citizen's greater freedom from federal intervention in his work and life. Equally we stand for effective government action in all phases of our national life where federal action can best do the job. Out of these broad principles grows our partnership policy among federal, state and local governments.

As we have prospered, we have vigorously -- and prayerfully -- pursued our greatest quest. For all things in our life would mean little -- without the faith that we, as a people, were on the road toward peace -- a peace of justice in a world of law. For many of us, the hopeful turning in that road seemed to come three years ago. That was the moment when death -- death in the mountains of Korea -- no longer cast its shadow across the homes of America. Yet that moment marked -- not the end -- but the beginning of our struggle for peace.

For though the guns are stilled, yet true peace -- a peace in which all peoples of the world may confidently trust -- means much more than this. It means a world in which all of man's toil serves his advancement -- not his destruction. And the winning of such peace, as I have said, requires struggle -- and struggle will certainly call for sacrifice.

How have we been waging this struggle? We have been helping other peoples in the world to save or to regain their own freedom. We have been perfecting our own military strength -- making it so effective and efficient that our free economy can sustain it for however long we live in peril.

And we have made clear to all peoples that America seeks strength only because America loves peace. The meeting at the summit of Geneva made this clear. The Presidents of all the Americas, meeting in Panama, recognized and applauded this. And there have been other clear proofs of our purpose: our plans for world disarmament -- program of atoms-for-peace -- fostering of world trade -- and helping other peoples combat poverty and need.

And our will to resist aggression must be made plain before -- and not after -- the event. For the first you can do with peaceful acts and policies. But the second you can do only with guns. In all our work for peace, we have constantly sought to strengthen our alliances -- and our understanding -- with all our friends in the world. Through meetings and constant correspondence with leaders of the other free nations -- many of them my personal friends -- I have tried to make firm our united purpose.

NO UNJUSTIFIED PROPOSALS

They -- the opposition -- have urged stout military defense with greater reliance on modern weapons -- but they advise stopping our atomic tests. They have promised national security and a bold role in world affairs -- while they urge us to start thinking about ending the military draft.

I, as your President and Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, cannot and will not make proposals contrary to national interest -- nor offer you attractive prospects unjustified by world realities. I will not promise that winning a peace based on justice will be cheap and easy. The issue of our military draft is no matter of a technical point to be scored in a political debate. It is a matter of the safety of our nation.

Why? Because we need the manpower. Because we cannot pretend that rockets and bombs make brains and hands obsolete. Because our future military burden must not be borne entirely by veterans who have already earned their nation's gratitude. Because we cannot encourage our allies in the world to shoulder arms -- while we throw ours to the ground. The truth before us is clear. Strong -- we shall stay free. Weak -- we shall have only our good intentions to be written as our epitaph.

The history of free men is never really written by chance -- but by choice -- their choice. It is a matter of national will, of political decision, of moral purpose. I would dare believe that history may say that, during the years of my first Administration, the faith of our people -- in the growth of peace and of justice -- grew steadily stronger.

And I would pray that -- if it be the people's will that I continue my present service -- the years of my second Administration may prove that -- thanks to the labor of all Americans -- this faith was justified.

RICHARD NIXON

Following is a partial text of an Oct. 9 speech by Vice President Nixon at Fort Worth, Texas:

As we enter the final four weeks of this campaign, millions of Americans are confronted with the same difficult decision they had to make in 1952 -- whether the interests of their country should be placed above the interests of their party? I know how difficult this decision is to the Democrats of a state like Texas which has contributed so greatly to the leadership and vitality of the Democrat party. It is understandable that we should all like to be able to conclude that what was best for our party is best for our country. But the greatest American presidents, Democrats and Republican, have always had substantial support from voters in both parties.

There are two questions which must be answered by those who make this decision.

1. Has President Eisenhower kept faith with the people?
2. Is he or his opponent better qualified by experience, background and judgment to keep the peace?

There can be no doubt as to the answer to the first question. After having failed to find prosperity in peacetime for 20 years, we now have the greatest prosperity this nation has ever enjoyed in war or peace. President Eisenhower has been President of all the people -- not just those of one party or one group. In the best American tradition he has rejected the alien idea that one class or one group of Americans should be played off against another. He got the United States out of one war; has kept it out of others; and his leadership promises the best chance for peace without surrender in the years ahead.

Every American can proudly hold the President up to his children as one who has faith in God, faith in America, and one who has restored dignity and respect to the highest office in the land. So much for the past and the present. The answer to the second question is even more important because it involves our future.

MUST BE LEADER

Most important qualification a President must have in these times is the ability to lead the United States and the free world to victory -- without war -- over the forces of international Communism which threatens the peace of the world. I say that when we measure the two candidates for President by this standard, Mr. Stevenson just isn't in the same league with President Eisenhower. I do not say this simply because of Mr. Stevenson's most recent blunders in which he jeopardized our military manpower position at the very moment when the free world was looking to America for consistent guidance and guarantees of continuing strength or because of his even more appalling suggestion that we should quit testing our H-bombs if the Soviet leaders would give what has proved to be their worthless word that they would do likewise.

But I say that President Eisenhower deserves the support of both Democrats and Republicans in this field because he is the unquestioned leader of the free world today. He has earned that position of leadership because he combines military background and experience with that special dedication to peace which only a man who knows the horrors of war firsthand can have. He has followed one simple rule in his dealings with the Communists. A policy of strength, not weakness, and of firmness, not vacillation. All Americans remember that the Acheson policy, which wrote off Korea in January of 1950, did not keep us out of the war we had to enter in June of that same year. The least that can be said for it is that it led the Communists to believe they could attack with safety and it therefore encouraged them to do so.

I can assure you that this type of defeatist thinking has never been and will never be accepted in high councils of this government as long as Dwight D. Eisenhower is President of the United States. We will never submit the United States to a wobbly, indecisive defense policy tied to a blow-hot, blow-cold diplomatic policy. There must be no peaks and valleys in our military preparedness as was the case during the Truman Administration, and unfortunately this doubtless would also hold true in a Stevenson Administration if his statement on the draft is any indication of

the path he will follow. In our generation we have twice gone to war at the very moment when we had relaxed our guard. It must not happen again. It will not, under President Eisenhower, because he will not foolishly give up our supremacy in nuclear weapons or our consistency in maintaining a proper level of trained manpower. This is no time to take a chance on second best leadership when we have the best in President Eisenhower.

When I was in Texas two weeks ago, I called upon Mr. Stevenson to tell the people of the United States what, if any, parts of the Truman, ADA policy, which he supported in 1952, he rejects today. In view of his silence on this issue, it is apparent now that he is determined to follow the same line in '56 as he did in '52. Those millions of Democrats who voted for President Eisenhower in 1952 did not desert the Democratic party. It is Mr. Stevenson, Mr. Truman, and their ADA colleagues who have deserted the Democratic party of Jefferson and Jackson. In 1956, as in 1952, President Eisenhower with his deep belief in the rights of individuals and states is more closely in tune with the true philosophy of millions of democrats than the ADA-Truman group with which Mr. Stevenson has apparently decided to cast his lot -- lock, stock and barrel.

PHILIP YOUNG

Following is a partial text of an Oct. 1 memorandum to President Eisenhower by Chairman Philip Young of the Civil Service Commission rebutting charges against the civil service made by Democrats:

Today after 45 months of your Administration, the American people can be proud of the efficiency and the effectiveness of their civil service. In the preceding 20 years, inbred bureaucracy had developed inefficiency and corruption in many quarters; for example, the Bureau of Internal Revenue. In that instance, some 200 Bureau of Internal Revenue employees were involved in misconduct charges in the post-war Democrat administration. They ranged from Hatch Act violations to grand scale theft.

Despite the highest employment levels that this country has ever seen, despite this great period of industrial prosperity and increase in take-home pay, the federal service is more attractive today as a career than it has ever been in any other period of prosperity. You are well aware of the intense pressures on our college graduates to accept posts in industry. The federal civil service, despite this competition, has received since October 1954, over 82,000 applications from these young men and women.

During the years covered by the previous Administration, it was most difficult for the federal service to attract college graduates not only because of low morale and inefficiency, but also because it was impossible for any new applicant coming into the civil service to acquire a permanent civil service appointment -- a passport to a career in the service of his country. It took until November, 1954, to straighten out this part of the mess and to establish a sound civil service appointment system.

When this Administration came into office in January of 1953, the turnover of federal employees was as high as 26 percent on an annual basis. For the last two years, turnover, annually, has been at 14 percent, and the quit rate has run consistently lower during this period than the rate for manufacturing industry.

In our form of government it is of the most vital importance that all of those positions which are truly of a policy-determining nature should be clearly identified and the policy-determining officials should be subject to change with any change in political administration. However, during the last years of the previous Administration, no stone was left unturned to bring as many policy-determining positions as possible under the protection of the civil service umbrella.

No one has been more zealous than you in seeking to protect and preserve, and to develop the integrity, the career opportunities, and the quality of our federal civil service. You have always insisted that career posts be clearly identified and distinguished from those policy-determining positions which should be subject to change. The American people, I am sure, understand this distinction, and will likewise insist that no matter what administration comes into power, the civil service must not be tampered with for political purposes, either at the beginning or at the ending of a Presidential term of office.

The record shows that over the last three years, of the 1,100 positions placed in Schedule C, which consists of policy-determining positions and associated jobs, only 248 of those came from the competitive civil service. At the same time, the record shows that during this period over 30,000 positions formerly outside of the competitive civil service have now been brought into the civil service on the basis of fair and just competition.

Over the last three years it has become well recognized that more progress has been made in the development and modernization of the career civil service system than in any comparable period since Theodore Roosevelt was President, 50 years ago. The establishment of the new civil service appointment system provided job security for 450,000 in definite employees and put the Federal appointment system back on a stable basis.

This new program represented a fresh approach to, and an appreciation of, the rights, privileges and obligations of career civil servants. It also provided the needed flexibility to adjust to changing conditions since it has built-in machinery to handle expansions and contractions of the federal service caused by periods of emergency. In the same executive order that established the new appointment system, you specifically prohibited political considerations of any kind in appointments to civil service jobs.

Here are some other major accomplishments which were stimulated by your administration's deep concern for the welfare of federal employees:

LIFE INSURANCE

Group Life Insurance -- This Administration initiated, and the Congress approved, a group life insurance program which covers over 95 percent of the more than two million eligible federal employees. Between Aug. 29, 1954, and May 31, 1956, more than \$78.5 million in benefits accrued to federal employees and their families insured under the program. Of this, \$72.7 million was paid out in life insurance claims and \$5.8 million in benefits for accidental death and dismemberment claims. This program is the largest of its kind in the world and involves approximately \$10 billion in insurance coverage.

Fringe Benefits -- Shortly after the establishment of the group life insurance program, a fringe benefits bill covering longevity pay increases, overtime pay rates, leave, uniforms, and other matters, was passed by the 83rd Congress. This law embraced most of the items contained in a statement you made on February, 1954, outlining the elements of a well rounded personnel program. At that time you said "I have been long convinced that a program combining the best practices of progressive private employers with the special demands of public service would greatly benefit our federal career system and its employees and would improve the efficiency of its administration."

Incentive Awards -- This fringe benefits bill also included provision for the establishment of an incentive awards program for federal employees. Under this program a federal employee may receive both honorary and monetary awards up to \$25,000 for exceptional service, superior performance, or for making improvements in the operations of the government. For the 19-month period that this program has been in effect cash awards have been made to employees totaling \$7.4 million. The employees who earned these superior performance awards have saved the American taxpayer almost \$143 million in cash. No price tag can be placed on the many other constructive results of this program.

Salary and Annuity Increases -- Other improvements in our federal personnel system have resulted in an average salary increase of 15 percent for federal employees over what they received a few years ago, as well as protection against salary reduction due to civil service reclassification, increases in travel allowances and increases in per diem rates. Retirement annuities for Federal employees have been directly increased by 25 percent and the provisions for surviving widows and children have been greatly liberalized.

Overseas Positions -- Thousands of positions in the territories and overseas have been brought into civil service on a competitive basis. The civil service is now world wide in character for the first time. This broadens the scope of career opportunities, for the federal employee can readily transfer to and from overseas positions within the civil service system.

When this Administration took office in 1953, 84 percent of all federal employees were covered by the civil service system. Today, three years later, this coverage has been increased to 85 percent. This record should be compared with what happened after 1932. In that year 80 percent of federal employees were under the competitive civil service. Two years later this had dropped to 67 percent. By 1936 almost 40 percent of all the positions in the federal service were being filled on a spoils-system basis, leaving only about 60 percent protected by the merit system.

Today, the federal employee has more security in his job and a better opportunity for an honorable and satisfying career than ever in the history of our government. I know that you believe this must be preserved at all costs and that the spoils operations of the 1930s must never be permitted to recur.

DEMOCRATS

These are the major statements and speeches of Democratic campaigners for the week ending Oct. 10:

ADLAI STEVENSON

Following is a partial text of an Oct. 3 speech by Stevenson at Pittsburgh, Pa., on which party had done more in recent years to help all the people meet everyday problems:

On Monday of this week, the real issue in this 1956 election campaign was joined. The Republican candidate for the Presidency said on Monday that this election will hinge on the question, as he put it, of "which party, in these recent years, has done more to help all citizens meet the problems of their daily lives." This is a proper statement. Of course, what matters is which party will do more in the future to help people meet the always new problems of their daily lives. But I'm sure that is what the Republican candidate meant. And he is right that each party's past record offers the best test of its future performance.

So, if the record is to be the test, let's get the record straight. I think it is too bad that the President indulged himself in such a gross misstatement of the record. I am sure he is an honorable man and could hardly have deliberately intended the misrepresentations which his speech included.

The President's speech referred to our social security program and he claimed credit on behalf of the Republican party for its enlargement. The fact is that this program -- which so vitally helps almost all our older citizens meet the problems of their daily lives -- was developed by Democrats against bitter Republican opposition. The fact is that in this very year in Congress the Democrats proposed that social security benefits be paid to employees 50 years old or older, who become permanently disabled, and to reduce the benefit eligibility age for women to 62. The fact is that 85 percent of the Democratic Senators voted for the change on disability and 84 percent of the Republicans voted against it.

The President reported in his listing of what he called Republican progress, that -- and I quote him -- "The minimum wage was increased." The fact is that he himself as well as his Congressional leaders -- ardently opposed the successful Democratic effort to raise the minimum wage to \$1.

The President even took credit in his speech for seeking a program to help distressed areas suffering from chronic local unemployment. The fact is that the only adequate bill to help these areas was introduced in Congress by Democrats, was passed by the Senate over strong Republican opposition, and was killed in the House by the President's own leaders.

The President tried to claim that this Republican Administration was the first to take up the cause of the needy farmer. The fact is that the Democrats initiated the program of Federal aid to the family farm with the Farm Security Administration nearly 20 years ago. President Eisenhower may have forgotten this -- but the farmers who worked their way from tenancy to ownership through this and other Democratic programs have not forgotten. The President even listed farm prices in his summary of Republican progress. The fact is that farm income declined by one quarter during his term of office.

"The cost of living," the President went on to say, "has been remarkably stabilized." The fact is that, by the statistics of his

own Department of Labor, the cost of living reached, this July, the highest point in history.

The President gave the Republican party credit for helping small business. The fact is that last year the rate of small business failures was higher than any time since the depression. The further fact is that the Eisenhower Administration offered no program for the relief of small business until this year, on the eve of the election and even then after Congress adjourned.

The President gave the Republican Administration credit for progress in civil rights -- and the areas of progress he enumerated were all federal responsibility and the gains were all initiated by Democratic Administrations. The fact is that the President has taken no clear position and exercised no leadership in connection with the pressing present problem of school desegregation.

The President gave the Republican Administration credit for a \$12-a-week average increase in wages since August, 1952. The fact is that a third of that increase took place in the first five months of this period -- under the Truman Administration. The President implied that the Republican tax cut of 1954 benefited everybody. The fact is that 91 cents of every dollar of that tax cut went to corporations and families with incomes above \$5000 a year.

The President even claimed that the Republican party had ended "special favoritism, cronyism and laxity" in Washington -- but the facts are written otherwise in the record of the Dixon-Yates contract, the natural resources give-away and the shotgun resignation of his Secretary of the Air Force, and other top-level officials of his Administration. And I won't mention the numerous loopholes in the tax law sponsored by his Administration.

GOP HELD RESPONSIBLE

The President said he and the Republicans wanted Federal aid to education -- and that the Democrats defeated it. The facts are -- and the President knows it -- first, that the only bill that came up for passage and which would have provided \$400 million a year for school construction was defeated by the Republicans in the House. Second, that during the first two years of his Administration, when he had a Republican Congress, he proposed no legislation for federal aid for schools.

These are the facts. I have no way of knowing whether the President knew them when he spoke, or whether he didn't. But someone did.

Are you a crippled miner, totally disabled, 50 years old, with children to feed and no way to do it -- until the Democrats in Congress this year made you eligible for social security benefits? Are you a working woman of 62 who can now retire -- because of the action of this Democratic Congress? Are you a man who almost lost his home in the depression -- until the Home Owners Loan Corporation saved it? Do you work in a steel mill here around Pittsburgh? Do you remember what the corporations did to your union -- until the Democrats passed the Wagner Labor Act?

Are you a storekeeper, a businessman who would have lost your business in the depression if it hadn't been for Franklin Roosevelt and a Democratic policy? Are you an auto worker in Detroit who worried about temporary unemployment -- until the Democrats established unemployment compensation? Did you almost lose your Iowa farm 20 years ago -- and did the Democratic farm program help you save it? This made a difference in your life -- and so does this Administration's attitude toward agriculture. When you were a child did you work in a sweatshop in the New York garment district, or were you a breakerboy in a Pennsylvania coal town? Well -- Democrats ended child labor.

Do you live in a part of the country where REA power lines, brought in during Democratic Administrations and against Republican opposition, have transformed life's whole pattern? Or are you a veteran from Minneapolis raising a family in a house in the suburbs -- because we Democrats made it possible for you to buy a home with a GI loan? I won't ask tonight if you are a mother with a 5-year-old wondering what kind of school he'll go to next year, or a housewife worrying about high prices.

Run down the list of the measures which "in these recent years" have strengthened the framework of economic security, social welfare and personal freedom. Ask yourself which of these measures originated with the Republicans, and which with the Democrats. And I haven't even mentioned TVA or the great industrial development in our great river valleys.

I say in all soberness that nearly every governmental program in our time -- in this generation -- which has helped citizens meet the problems of their daily lives more effectively, which has enriched, enlarged and brightened their daily lives, has been a Democratic program. And I further say that this is no accident. There is a deep and continuing difference between our parties -- a difference in composition, in tradition and in ideals.

Thomas Jefferson defined the fundamental differences nearly a century and a half ago when he said that men are divided in two parties: "Those who fear and distrust the people," and "those who identify themselves with the people." And Alexander Hamilton replied for the opposite tradition that the nation should be governed by the "rich and well-born."

President Eisenhower's Administration has reflected the philosophy of his party. But the Democratic party has had different values and a different tradition. Our faith has always been in the people -- that their welfare is the paramount obligation. Our hope is to build a society -- a new America -- where the ideals we inherited from our forefathers will find a new fulfillment in a land of freedom and justice; where our abundance will serve, not just a few -- not just what Hamilton called the "rich and well-born," but all of us.

Harlem Speech

Following is a partial text of an Oct. 4 speech by Stevenson in Harlem, a section of New York City:

I am proud to come to Harlem tonight as candidate for President of the United States.

I am proud because I come as the representative of the party which through history has been dedicated to the people of America -- the Democratic party. In the last generation the Democratic party has achieved social and economic and spiritual gains which have transformed American society, and it has done so under the leadership of two great-hearted Americans, Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman. Our party has fought valiantly for the plain people of America through its past, and I am here tonight to tell you that so long as I am its spokesman and leader, it will fight as hard as ever for the people in the years ahead. And because the people know that, it will win the election in November.

We have come a long way in the battle for human dignity and opportunity in America. But we still have far to go. The Democratic party has led the fight against poverty and discrimination, and it is still our purpose to carry on that fight as long as those ugly specters still haunt American life. We are the richest nation in the world, the richest nation in history. And it is an indictment of our intelligence and humanity if we cannot provide every family in the country a decent opportunity to earn a living, a decent school, a decent roof over their heads and a decent prospect of security in old age. We have had four years of Republican rule -- four years of shutting and postponement -- four years of "time out" in the battle for expanding human dignity. The time has come to resume our onward march.

There are still miles and miles of slums in America. And every American family wants to escape from misery and squalor. We need new houses -- millions of them. We need a sound and imaginative public housing program. Every American who has taken the trouble to see how other people live in our country knows that these conditions exist and must be met. But I say to you that under the Democrats we will have public housing and urban renewal programs that will help provide every American family with an opportunity for a decent home in a decent neighborhood. You have already seen here in Harlem how public housing can begin to transform a community and make it a place where you can be proud to live -- but then you have Democratic Mayors here in New York.

But food and dress and shelter are not all that matter to a good life. Man's highest fulfillment comes in the realm of the spirit -- in the fulfillment of his inward sense of dignity, his responsibility and his freedom. America has made progress toward that fulfillment, too, and that progress has come in the main, I am proud to say, through the leadership of the Democratic party.

Yet we have seen nothing more brazen in the entire record of Republican misrepresentation in this campaign than the Republican credit for progress in civil rights. They have claimed credit for

ending segregation in the armed forces. Well, you know, I happen to have been in on that story right from the start and these Johnny-come-lately Republican claims make me pretty disgusted.

In 1941 and 1942 I was assistant to the Secretary of the Navy. And it was then that we took the first and the hard steps toward removing the racial barriers in the United States Navy. My part in that was small and we only got the job started then, but we did get it started. Then, on July 26, 1948, President Truman issued his Executive Order No. 9981. It was that order that sounded the death knell of segregation in the armed forces.

That order was issued despite the testimony of Chief of Staff Dwight D. Eisenhower before a Congressional committee on April 2, 1948, that complete desegregation in the armed forces would, as he put it, get us "into trouble." But four years later Candidate Eisenhower admitted in a speech at Chicago on Oct. 31, 1952, that -- and these are his words -- "Now, so far as I know, there is nothing in the way of segregation in the Army, Navy, Air Force or Marines left -- at least as a matter of official record." Why then, why did President Eisenhower tell the American people last Monday, in listing the accomplishments of his Administration, that one thing the Republicans have done since 1952 is to end segregation in the armed forces?

I don't mind the President's trying to make off in broad daylight with the Democratic platform -- he always returns it right after Election Day anyway -- but he better stop trying to run on the Democratic record. The Republicans have claimed credit for stopping discrimination in employment by Government contractors though all they did was to continue the work begun by the Fair Employment Practices Commission under President Roosevelt and by the Committee on Government Contract Compliance under President Truman. For that we are grateful.

SILENT ON LEADERSHIP

They have even claimed credit for ending segregation in the District of Columbia, though the case which meant the end of segregation in many public places in the District was initiated at the time President Truman was in office and while Mr. Eisenhower was still a private citizen. And finally, when the President was presented with an opportunity for great national leadership in this field, he was virtually silent. I am referring to the Supreme Court decision on desegregation in the public schools.

Surely the greatest problem we face here at home this year is the issue of civil rights. We have faced it continuously for many years in varying forms and changing urgency. I faced it when I was Governor of Illinois. During that interval we desegregated the National Guard; we used the National Guard to protect the safety of citizens in the Cicero riots; and we came within an ace of passing a fair employment practices act -- and were prevented from doing so only by a close vote in a Republican legislature. We eliminated all racial designations in the employment service of Illinois and on drivers' licenses, and so on.

Yet, despite the progress we have made, the achievement of equality of rights and opportunities for all American citizens is still the great unfinished business before the United States. The Supreme Court decision on desegregation in the public schools was an expression of our steady movement toward genuine equality for all before the law, and it expressed in a new field the old principle that the American heritage of liberty and opportunity is not to be confined to men, women and children of a single race, a single religion or a single color.

I have spoken about this decision many times. Last week I spoke about it in Arkansas, and I am glad to have the opportunity to say here what I said there:

"The Supreme Court of the United States has determined unanimously that the Constitution does not permit segregation in the schools. As you know, for I have made my position clear on this from the start, I believe that decision to be right. Some of you feel strongly to the contrary. But what is most important is that we agree that once the Supreme Court has decided this constitutional question, we accept that decision as law-abiding citizens."

And this statement, I am heartened to tell you tonight, brought applause from those who heard me in Arkansas. I continued: "Our common goal is the orderly accomplishment of the result decreed by the court. I said long ago, and I stand now squarely on the plain statement, adopted in the Democratic Platform, that 'we reject all

proposals for the use of force to interfere with the orderly determination of these matters by the courts'."

The Court's decree provides for the ways and means of putting into effect the principle it sets forth. I am confident that this decision will be carried out in the manner prescribed by the courts. I have repeatedly expressed the belief, however, that the office of the Presidency should be used to bring together those of opposing views in this matter -- to the end of creating a climate for peaceful acceptance of this decision. The President of the United States recently said of the Supreme Court decision, "I think it makes no difference whether or not I endorse it." As for myself, I have said from the beginning -- and say now -- that I support this decision. We have a code in this country -- a design by which Americans live with one another. It is called the Bill of Rights. It should not only be obeyed, it should be respected.

Yale University Speech

Following is a partial text of an Oct. 5 speech by Stevenson at Yale University, New Haven, Conn.:

I am particularly glad to be here at Woolsey Hall tonight because I always enjoy speaking at colleges. Now whenever I say this I can see most of my entourage wince -- particularly those egg-heads who surround me, all of whom are hardboiled now.

The Republican sales managers thought that the President's endorsement would be enough to make their product go. But now they are having to reconsider their sales campaign -- I think they call it "agonizing reappraisal." For they have discovered that the people aren't satisfied just to see the Republican leaders. They also want to hear what they have to say. This discovery has caused a serious intellectual crisis in Republican ranks. And it is, of course, why the Republicans recently issued their Macedonian cry for intellectuals. I understand that at this very moment Republican talent scouts are beating the darkest recesses of Time, Inc., the Ivy League and the Partisan Review.

And I say: more power to them. But I say, too, that liberalism or humanity in government, or real concern for people -- or whatever you want to call it -- this spirit of newness the Republican candidates are now pretending to -- whatever it is, it is not something that a political party can pick up like an acquired accent. It isn't something you can buy by the speech, or on Madison Ave.

We've been working on it in the Democratic party for 150 years now. We're not going to claim any patent infringement, for we're trying to improve the product ourselves and we're glad for any help or new ideas. But we're frankly pretty confident that we can beat any competition that relies on words as a substitute for action. The Republican candidates can't say with much vigor and enthusiasm what they want to do -- because they don't want to do anything very much. They can't promise to accomplish great things over the next four years -- without explaining why they failed to accomplish them in the last four.

SOCIALISM ACCUSATION

Denied his favorite device of associating Democrats with Communism, at least while traveling a higher road, Mr. Nixon has reverted to the familiar technique of associating Democrats with socialism. This is standard operating procedure in the newly self-styled "party of the future." Only the other day Ezra Benson, the Secretary of Agriculture, was calling the leaders of the northwest grain cooperatives socialists. And, of course, the Republicans have opposed nearly every social advance within the memory of man as "socialistic."

Hard-hitting, factual debate is the essence of democracy. Innuendo, smear and slander are not. They debauch the language of politics; they defile the dialogue which is the means by which free society governs itself. George Orwell once said that, if you want to corrupt a people, first corrupt the words in which they express themselves. The English language can take a lot, especially in election year, but there are limits to the burden of deceit and infamy which it should be asked to bear.

I don't believe any victory is worth winning in a democracy unless it can be won by placing full trust in the members of the democracy. I mean giving people the hard facts and the hard decisions, trusting their sobriety and their judgment, regarding

them not as the customers of government, to be sold, but as the owners of government, to run their own affairs. I mean resisting today's temptations to rely on soft-soap slogans, gimmicks, band-wagons and all the other infernal machines of modern high-pressure politics in this age of mass manipulation. The premise of such manipulations is contempt -- contempt for people's intelligence, common sense and dignity.

The second corollary is that the political party can never be considered an end in itself. It is only an agency for a larger purpose. Again, let no one misunderstand me. I believe in party loyalty and party responsibility. I am a Democrat, a good party Democrat, a very proud Democrat. But that very pride depends upon my heartfelt conviction that this party is an instrument for carrying out certain principles for the establishment of certain values. What is of fundamental and lasting importance are the ideals a party incarnates, and the purpose of the party is to make government serve our lives as it should serve them.

It is easy and proper and very right to assert that the fortunes of our party are, in the long view, closely and integrally related to our national welfare. Our long history of public service -- its many contributions to that welfare in time of crisis, domestic and foreign -- can leave no doubt of this. What is more important is to be sure we keep it always in mind that the fortunes of our party even in the short run are of infinitely less importance than the national interest as it is conceived of by all our citizens in and out of direct party affiliation or allegiance.

WORLD MOVES ON

Is it not the very essence of greatness, in a person as in an institution, to face squarely the often uncomfortable fact that the world moves on with the inexorable succession of the years? New problems arise, new challenges are presented, and, most important of all, new opportunities are provided which, if not seized upon with courage and energy and imagination, are shouldered aside by the relentless cycle of time. I do not believe that we Democrats have the answers for 1956 simply because we had them for 1932. No more do I believe that the Republicans have them for this present movement in time simply because the country turned to them in 1952. And the greatest mistake we as a people could make would be to confuse 1956 with 1952 simply because the same two individuals are carrying the party standards.

As one of these individuals, I am peculiarly exposed to the temptation of thinking that the issues are the same because the faces are the same. But I try to resist it because I know that to yield is to defy the overriding law of life which is change.

I think the central issue in 1956, particularly for the uncommitted voter, is that complacency contains the seeds of decay, not of growth. It is at war with our national genius. It falsifies the tradition which has taken shape in sharp and glowing outline throughout our 180 years as an independent people. In the few periods when its siren song has been heard most loudly in the land, it has been a prelude to a harsher melody in which the saddest note is one of mourning for what might have been. We have heard a very great deal and we are going to hear a lot in the weeks ahead about prosperity and peace. But surely the uneven measure of prosperity we now enjoy, and the restless and uneasy peace in which we now find ourselves, were not achieved by standing still and admiring them. We have become the world's envy because we never stopped raising our sights, because we constantly set new goals for ourselves even as we gained the old, because pretty good was never good enough.

I do not believe that it is in character for us as a people to rest in contemplation of the schools we have when we know we need more, to pause in the building of a prosperity which has no place for the family farmer, the little business enterprise, the displaced worker, and the aged pensioner. I do not believe we really believe that we have peace while the world is divided into hostile camps and smoldering in between, and we are spending \$40,000,000,000 a year for war. In our hearts we know we must be up and doing, probing ceaselessly for new break-throughs in our endless striving for solutions for today's problems and for the new ones that tomorrow will find on our doorstep, searching always for better answers than the ones we have been able to come up with thus far. We know that the gospel of discontent is the prophet of progress.

Our national purpose is not just to have an election and get it out of the way. Our purpose is not to watch a horse race in which all we care about is victory and at almost any price. Our purpose is to show how a great nation rises to the responsibility of self-government -- and how it emerges from the experience purified in purpose, strengthened in resolution and united in faith. At least, speaking for myself, this is why I am here, and -- if you think hard that is why you are here at Yale. We know our goals; education will help us find our paths.

R.I. Textile Speech

Following is the partial text of an Oct. 6 speech by Stevenson at Providence, R.I., in which he discussed the textile industry and tariffs:

You are choosing this November between a party whose whole history and purpose has been one of caring primarily about people and a party whose whole history and purpose has been one of caring first of all for the property. We should be thankful for the prosperity and well-being we enjoy, and we are. But let's not exaggerate, and let's not leave these people out and forget about them.

And are we just supposed to forget about the workers in New England's textile mills, about mills that are closed, about others operating three to four days a week, about skilled workers who have given 15 or 20 years of their lives and are now middle-aged and unemployed or half-employed? These people can, I know, in good Republican theory, just pull up stakes and learn new trades. Well, it isn't that easy -- especially if you're along in years. New jobs don't come easy after you're 45 or 50. And many people don't want, naturally enough, to move away from the community in which you have put down your roots.

You may remember that the Republican Presidential candidate visited Lawrence, Mass., four years ago and promised the workers around there that the federal government would take special steps to increase the number of jobs in their cities. Has anything happened? When the election was over, nothing was done -- except to reduce further the tariff on textiles. In the words of one of President Eisenhower's advisors, the textile workers could enjoy the right to suffer.

And something else has happened, too, since those special efforts. Instead of more jobs, textile workers lost thousands of jobs in the next years -- more than 100,000, or about 10 percent, in a single year. And, when Democratic Senators proposed a strong area redevelopment bill to help localities with a high degree of unemployment, the Republicans put in a weak bill of their own, fought the Democratic bill in the Senate and finally prevented it even from being brought up for consideration in the House.

TARIFF LIBERALIZATION

I want to speak frankly about the question of tariffs. My party has always believed in the liberalization of trading and the reduction of trade barriers. I believe myself that the policy of keeping other countries out of American markets leads, in the end, to isolation and disaster. I believe in trade and more trade, and trading means buying as well as selling. So I am in general opposed to tariff increases which discourage buying and therefore selling abroad. I believe equally strongly that tariff reduction must be applied with human concern, with intelligence, and with a sense of the nation's long-run interests. And I don't share the Eisenhower Administration's unfeeling attitude toward the troubles of the textile industry.

Let me put it concretely. I believe in a policy of gradual tariff reduction. I do not believe that the brunt of this policy should be borne by weak industries or by parts of the country under special economic strain. I do not believe that we can allow an industry which has lost more than 40 percent of its jobs in eight years to be exposed, through further tariff cuts, to destruction from abroad. The problem of increasing world trade and of relieving the dollar shortage is a national problem. The burden of solving that problem should be allocated among industries and regions of the country as equitably as possible.

The burden of solving that problem is a national responsibility. It should not be the sole burden of the factories and the people of one industry and one region. People do not want to leave their

hearth and home. And because they don't they should not be forced out of their present jobs before other jobs are made available. If national policy calls for tariff reduction -- national policy calls also for certain and reliable jobs for those who are affected.

Now I know that after years of indifference the Administration has made its election year gesture toward the textile industry. It has done the same for farmers, for schools and so forth. Just a few days ago Sherman Adams suddenly announced that the Administration is working on an agreement with Japan to reduce the flow of textile imports. Almost at the same time an increase in woolen tariffs was announced. This political cynicism a month before the election is all the Administration, after four years, has to suggest for the most troubled industry in America. What about those promises made in 1952? What about the merger problem, what about really doing something with government contracts for areas with surplus labor?

What about really doing something with government contracts for areas with surplus labor? What about really doing something with government contracts for small business? What about the bill for federal aid to distressed areas -- the bill the Republicans killed this summer in Congress? What about a flood insurance bill that does not saddle the states hardest hit with an unreasonable share of the costs? The prosperity of textiles involves people, and it can only be handled by an Administration which sees economic problems in terms of homes and families and communities.

I make no sweeping promises about solving the textile problem. But I pledge you the sympathetic and compassionate concern of a Democratic Administration dedicated to finding a place for this indispensable industry -- textiles -- in a regional economy which will continue to grow so long as thrift, craftsmanship, hard work and intelligence count in the affairs of a nation.

And what goes for textiles goes for small business. We have seen an Administration so dominated by the big and strong and rich that it has had little concern for the little man -- the vanishing man. It has amiably stood by while the merger movement has acquired new momentum. It has watched the failure rate in small business reach the highest point in years. It has assigned men to jobs who have little belief in the future of small business. Its tight money policy makes it hard for the small man to get the money he needs and leaves the big man, with his ample reserves, in a still more favored position.

FOUNDATION OF INITIATIVE

We Democrats believe in small business -- because small business has been the foundation of American initiative and enterprise. We think he can be helped to survive in this age of bigness -- by helping him get the capital and credit he needs at reasonable terms, by making the tax laws more equitable for him, by a larger share of government contracts, by more attention to our merger and monopoly laws, and by putting the Small Business Administration in the hands of men who really care about small business.

The difference between the two parties can be stated very simply. When the Republican leaders think of economic problems, they see a ledger and a cashbook. When Democrats think of economic problems, they see men, women and children.

There is so much to do, and I am convinced that the great majority of Americans want to get at it, to move ahead -- to get on with the job. We want to build more schools and train more teachers for our children. We want to build more hospitals and train more doctors for our sick and ailing. We want to give our farmers a chance to live a decent life. We want to strengthen our system of social security. We want to restore the Bill of Rights in all its splendor as the center of the American faith. We want to make our land once again the beacon of hope for people everywhere -- so that our country can regain the leadership of the free world and rally the free peoples in the cold, remorseless, unending war against communism that has been spreading to wider areas during these last years.

We have heard strange things in the land of late: The President exhorting Vice President Nixon and the Republican campaigners to tell the truth -- (he could have chosen no better audience for that) -- and then the President himself talking as if the Republican party had invented the social reforms we call the New Deal, which they fought every step of the way. The Republicans, oblivious of Stalin's death, even tell us that Eisenhower stopped

the Korean War, omitting to add on no better terms than the Communists turned down under Truman 18 months before while Stalin was alive.

Now the United States has been in a number of wars, and I have always thought most of the credit for ending them belongs to the soldiers who gave their lives to stop the enemy. If, however, the Republicans think this honor should go to political leaders, then I might point out that the two greatest wars of all time were stopped by Woodrow Wilson, Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry Truman.

Health Statement

Following is a partial text of an Oct. 8 statement by Stevenson outlining his proposals for a national health program:

The New America means to me an America in which we use to the full our almost unbelievably great resources for the enrichment and the fulfillment of human life. The greatest resource is of course, life itself. It is people, our bodies, our minds, our spirit. The worst loss we can suffer is death. The worst waste we can commit is illness. The saddest thing in life is human suffering in mind or body.

Some of the facts about the nation's health are shocking. As things now stand, and unless and until we do something about it: One out of every 12 American children born this year will have to spend some time in a mental institution; 10 million Americans are suffering from arthritis; one out of every seven Americans will die of cancer; our hospitals are jammed to the doors and in many hospitals even the corridors are being used as space for beds; Doctors and nurses are critically scarce in many parts of the country and are working too hard for their own health and well-being almost everywhere. Almost a quarter of a million people die each year whom medical science knows how to save; the cost of medical care is beyond the reach of millions of American families; the annual loss to the nation from illness is approximately \$30,000,000,000 a year, a sum roughly equivalent to the total individual income tax revenue of the federal government.

There is another side to this picture: On the whole, Americans clearly are living longer and healthier lives than ever before and are fortunate in comparison with other peoples. Because doctors and medical researchers have made great progress in the diagnosis and treatment of the diseases of childhood and youth, the average age of Americans is increasing. This is, of course, part of the reason we are more vulnerable than we need to be to diseases of middle and old age, such as cancer, heart disease and arthritis, to name only three.

WELL BEING

Probably nothing contributes more to an individual's sense of well-being, once his basic needs for food, clothing and shelter are met, than good health. I believe that in developing a national health program, we should and will accept the following principles:

1. Access to good medical care is a basic human right in a civilization founded, as ours is, on the dignity and worth of the individual human being.
2. The federal government should do, toward promoting health in America, only what cannot be done -- or as a practical matter will not be done -- privately or through any other agency.
3. The pursuit of knowledge, in medicine as in all other fields, must be free and the practice of medicine must rest upon a private relationship between patient and doctor.

The fundamental purpose of a national health program is quite simply to improve the health of all our people. To do this requires, in addition to such accepted and on-going programs as those to assure the purity of our food and drugs, the safety of our water supplies, protection against epidemics, and so on, progress toward four major goals.

First, we must make sure that medical research, which underlies all medical progress, is not held back by lack of funds.

Second, we must train enough doctors, dentists, specialists, nurses and other medical personnel so that all genuine needs for medical care can be met.

Third, we must build enough hospitals and other facilities that all genuine needs for institutional care can be satisfied.

Fourth, we must assure against anyone's being denied good medical care for financial reasons.

The concern of the Democratic party with the nation's health is not an election-year phenomenon; it is a long-standing concern, which has found tangible expression in countless good works.

Men have long and rightly been fascinated by the great stories of medical research and have reserved a special place in their affections for the great figures of medical history. One by one, ancient scourges like smallpox have been conquered. Child-birth once took the lives of many, many many mothers; it no longer does, and what this has meant in terms of human happiness is beyond measurement. The terrible killers of children -- scarlet fever, diphtheria, typhoid fever, respiratory ailments and others have been eradicated or brought under quite effective control, and now we have all been thrilled to learn that poliomyelitis, a disease that darkened every summer and struck fear into the hearts of all parents, is being conquered.

There remain today, however, broad frontiers still to be crossed in the world of medical research. The most basic need is for more young men and women trained for medical research. No amount of money spent on research and no multiplication of modern laboratories will produce results unless there are good researchers to use them. Only a few young men and women have the special qualities of mind and character that are needed. It is all the more important, therefore, to make sure that those who have research potentialities are enabled to develop them.

There is a large and growing need for modern laboratories and other facilities, especially facilities independent of the federal government and located at hospitals and other institutions around the country. Congressional investigations have revealed that many worthwhile research projects are being held back by lack of adequate facilities. According to a report of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, admirably qualified researchers are sometimes "unable to make their services available to the people of America simply because they do not have the laboratories, facilities and equipment with which to do the work the nation and the Congress very much want to have done."

RESEARCH FUNDS

The third need is for research funds. The report of the Hoover Commission on research and development in May, 1955, indicated that several hundred projects which had already been approved could not be undertaken in the fiscal year 1956 because the Department of Health, Education and Welfare had not even requested the necessary funds. Last year the government spent more money for eradication of hoof and mouth disease than for research on mental illness, which afflicts 9,000,000 people. It spends three times as much money on animal and plant disease research as on cancer research. Indeed, medical research receives less than five cents of each federal research dollar.

This year the Eisenhower Administration asked for \$127,000,000 for the National Institutes of Health, including research programs. This was raised to \$184,000,000 by the Congress over the strong opposition of the Administration. In all four years of this Administration the Democratic leadership in Congress, aided by a minority of Republicans, has raised the inadequate sums proposed by President Eisenhower.

A good example is the field of mental health. The Democratic 84th Congress launched a vigorous attack on mental illness. Rejecting inadequate proposals by the Administration, it voted to triple the size of the psychiatric research program and to double the program for training desperately needed psychiatrists. It also greatly increased support for community health clinics and other preventive measures. Aware that mental illness costs the nation more than \$1,000,000,000 a year and fills more than half of our hospital beds, the Congress also contributed to a searching three-year non-governmental study of the entire human and economic impact of mental illness.

The United States needs more doctors. We have fewer doctors today, relative to our population, than a century ago. Responsible estimates indicate that we need 25,000 more doctors right now. Because our population is rising rapidly, the need will become larger and more critical in the years ahead. There are two major reasons for the growing shortages. First, our medical schools are overcrowded and understaffed. The National Fund for

Medical Education has estimated that the nation's medical schools need new buildings which will cost from \$250,000,000 to \$300,000,000, and an additional income of \$15,000,000 a year to meet present operating deficits.

To help meet one of these needs Senator Lister Hill proposed in 1955 that the federal government give \$250,000,000 over a five-year period in matching grants to medical schools for construction only. Although this proposed legislation was supported by the American Medical Assn. and the deans of most of our medical schools, it was opposed by Secretary Hobby on the familiar ground that it "required more study." In 1956, an election year, the Administration at last recognized -- at least in principle -- the crisis in medical education. This year Congress appropriated \$90,000,000 for construction of laboratory research facilities. What is needed now is a larger appropriation for general medical school construction.

The second reason for the doctor shortage is the high cost of medical education. We must do more than build new buildings; we must enable promising young men and women to enter them. With the present high costs, medical education is beyond the financial reach of many qualified young people.

I therefore favor a federal loan and scholarship program for medical education along the lines indicated in the program for education which I recently presented. If such a loan and scholarship program is adopted, I would hope that it would be administered in such a manner as to serve particularly the special need for doctors in depressed and underprivileged areas. Perhaps priority consideration could be given to applicants for loans or scholarships from these areas, upon their commitment to serve in these areas for a period following their education.

OVERCROWDED HOSPITALS

The Hill-Burton program has made possible the building of many hospitals and has made hospital care available in many communities which had been without it before. Nevertheless, it is obvious, as any one knows who has recently visited a hospital, that most hospitals are overcrowded. In many hospitals, patients are quartered in corridors for lack of enough rooms. Many hospitals are old and not well equipped to provide modern care.

There is a need, too, for modern institutions for the care of the mentally ill, for the care of those with chronic diseases, and, as I pointed out in my program for the older citizens, for the care of the aged, and I think we may find there is both economy and mercy in a large expansion of our program for preventive community health clinics, which have done so much to curb juvenile delinquency, help families with other problems and to prevent uncounted people from disappearing into mental institutions. We need to continue and expand the Hill-Burton program.

As I said earlier, our American society has reached the point where we should recognize that access to good medical care is a basic human right. Yet we know all too well that millions of our fellow citizens today receive wholly inadequate medical care, despite the donation of much time by America's doctors -- because these people cannot afford that care. We know that this is particularly true of preventive medicine. We know, too, that in hundreds of thousands of American homes, serious illness has wiped out a lifetime's savings and replaced it with discouraging debt. This is expensive social wastefulness. It inflicts needless suffering, even death, on many individuals. It denies too many the equal opportunity for useful, happy lives. And we know from experience that there are ways and means at hand for meeting these problems.

We learned long ago that where natural tragedies and disaster often strike in a haphazard, unpredictable way, it is to the advantage of all to share by the insurance principle the cost of the misfortunes which befall a few. The American people have gone further than the people of any other country in applying this saving principle to such misfortunes as fire and flood and storm. Nothing is more American than this cooperative way of dealing with misfortune.

For a vast number of our fellow citizens comprehensive private health insurance is now wholly beyond financial reach. The vast majority of our older citizens cannot afford it and these are people who need this protection most. Careful studies show, too, that such insurance is characteristically unavailable, as a matter of practical economics, to families with a more than average

Campaign Statements - II

number of children, particularly when the children are young and when medical care is most needed for them. I strongly suspect, although I find no specific data to prove it, that there is a high correlation between inadequate medical care and delinquency -- although I recognize that other factors may explain this.

Let's get several facts clear:

Health insurance works. We have had enough experience with private health insurance to establish this beyond a doubt.

Health insurance need not, and our present health insurance system does not, interfere in any way with the private relationship between patient and doctor, which is a fundamental of good medical practice. It is a way of spreading the cost of medical care with fairness and justice; it has nothing whatever to do with the relation between patient and doctor beyond the payment of the bill.

More than 100,000,000 Americans now have some form of health insurance. It should be pointed out at once, however, that most of the policies do not provide comprehensive protection. They cover, in the usual case, only hospitalization -- and by no means even all the hospital costs. Indeed, only 3 percent of the American people, it has been reported, have comprehensive health insurance covering house and office calls, surgery, hospitalization, rehabilitation services and so forth.

It is clear to me that what is good for millions of Americans would be good enough for all. I am opposed to socialized medicine. I am equally strongly in favor of a program to make comprehensive private health insurance available on a voluntary basis to all Americans, so that no American will be denied good medical care for financial reasons.

There are many ways in which this could be accomplished. I would, as President, urge upon Congress the immediate consideration of the various proposals which have been made to achieve this end. And I would urge full consideration of the views of all concerned -- the medical profession, insurance experts, representatives of the groups which would benefit from the program. But I would insist that it is a practical and an essential objective: to make comprehensive health insurance available and attainable to everyone.

FEDERAL AID NEEDED

It is clear that some form of federal aid will be required to achieve this goal. This might take the form of long-term interest-bearing loans, as proposed by Senator Hubert Humphrey, to cooperative, labor and other groups desirous of getting started on group health insurance programs. This approach would help to meet the needs of groups who are not now covered and who only need capital to get their programs underway.

Some of the federal aid might take the form of matching grants to the states to pay part of the costs of voluntary health insurance for low income families and individuals. The principle which should guide us in developing this program is, I believe, the historic principle imbedded in our medical practice and our humanitarian philosophy of government, that those who can pay their own way should, that those who can pay a major part should pay that part and that those who can pay little or nothing should pay what they can and should be assisted with the rest.

The administration of the program should rest with the states. The federal government would assure itself, before making grants available, that the insurance policies meet certain standards, that they provide, in short, truly comprehensive protection. No one would be compelled to obtain this protection, but I am confident that most people would wish to take advantage of it. This program involves federal aid. In the course of our history many of our great social advances have come in this way. We have subsidized home-owners, thus building and strengthening a free agriculture; we have subsidized education, thus building and strengthening a free society; we have as a people contributed to our own economic growth by subsidies to railroads, shipping lines, air transport, the development of power, thus building and strengthening free enterprise.

There is nothing more basic than the health of the American people, nothing more important to their future welfare and happiness and equality of opportunity. It is time now to take this next step forward and to use the resources of the government of the people for the people's health. We shall discover that this, too,

will strengthen the foundation of freedom and be another demonstration to the world of the marvelous ability of a free people to adopt its institutions to humanitarian purposes.

ESTES KEFAUVER

Following is a partial text of an Oct. 2 speech by Estes Kefauver at Los Alamos, N.M., on the atomic energy program:

Not all nations are as fortunate as the United States in the source of fuels and of falling waters to produce electrical energy. The present Suez crisis re-emphasizes how dependent the world is on energy-producing fuels. Therefore, it has been a source of dire concern to me to note that under the political administration of the Atomic Energy Commission which the Republicans brought about we have lost our long lead in the struggle to develop nuclear power and have, in fact, dropped behind other countries.

While Admiral Lewis Strauss, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, busied himself injecting the AEC into politics through the notorious Dixon-Yates deal, other nations outstripped us in peaceful application of this marvelous new development. We Democrats knew this was going to happen when we fought against the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, sponsored by the Eisenhower Administration. Under the terms of this act the government was restrained from taking action to construct reactors designed to demonstrate the practicality of commercial generation of electricity. Two years of the Act's operation offer conclusive evidence that we are simply not getting ahead with the job. Private companies have shown little interest in the construction of power reactors without government help. Within the economics of private power production, this reluctance is understandable. As business operations, with a vested interest in present plant, and with a primary motive of reducing risk and increasing profit, they could hardly be expected to take the lead in blazing untested trails.

However, we cannot just go on -- letting the policy of drift throw us farther and farther behind in the effort which is sweeping this world to turn the power of the atom into its peaceful uses. We are doing just that. The AEC has sold \$36 worth of electricity from a prototype reactor designed for use in submarines, located at West Milton, N.Y. Another reactor is being constructed at Shippingport, Pa., which is expected to produce between 60,000 and 100,000 KW when completed in 1957. It, however, is being built with government funds authorized under the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 prior to the present act. Nothing is being built which would produce so much as one kilowatt under the new program. All plans are still in the planning stage.

RUSSIAN PLANT

The Soviet has presented papers on a 5,000 kilowatt atomic plant which they said has been in operation since June of 1954. I visited a small station when I was behind the Iron Curtain this past fall. The British will put their first large atomic power plant into operation in October of this year. Furthermore, the British have a 10-year program to build 22 reactors to provide approximately 2½ million kilowatts of capacity. The French will put their first small reactor into operation this year, and they plan to have a large one in operation about the same time we do.

Despite this record, the political Admiral Strauss went before a meeting of the Board of Governors of the World Bank last week and painted a rosy picture of the Atomic Energy Program. The purpose of the meeting was to give the Board a chance to judge when the World Bank itself might begin to play a part in nuclear power activities abroad. Even more serious than the distortions which his statement evidenced was the fact that this politically minded and prejudiced gentleman decided to inject domestic politics into this international meeting. He said and I quote -- "Thus far, we have resisted pressures -- mainly political -- to establish arbitrary goals of installed kilowatts for a set date since we are not entered in a number game."

Now I want to make one thing clear, we Democrats don't believe that there should be either a government or a private monopoly in the development of nuclear power. We are simply proposing a government policy which is calculated to get us off dead center. An imaginative and intelligent attitude, on the part of the government, one which would provide the temporary leadership that is needed, is a must at this time.

Capitol Quotes

● **WORLD SERIES** -- "I am not an avid baseball fan.... Even in the World Series I can't find the opportunity to learn much more than the scores, but every night I glance over the stories of the game with an interested eye and a feeling of security. No matter what is happening in the world...I can draw a certain feeling of peace from the knowledge that we've managed to work things out to another World Series time. It is not important to me who wins...the great thing is that they play those October series each year.... As long as baseball is played...as long as it is more important to candidates in an election than an afternoon's speeches...I can look out of my window...and understand the great importance of our government's guarantee of personal freedom and choice, and feel certain that it will always be this way as long as bats crack in the ballpark and the World Series comes around." -- Rep. Elizabeth Kee (D W.Va.) Oct. 8 newsletter.

● **MIDWEST FARMER** -- "Drought and low income have hit the Midwest farmer hard.... In the years 1948 through 1952...average farm and family living expenses totalled 78 percent of farm income.... In the last three years...102 percent.... There is a growing need for policies that will halt this adverse trend." -- Sen. Stuart Symington (D Mo.) Oct. 10 release.

● **CAMPAIGN** -- "This week, the tensions generated by our quadrennial political battles were beginning to be felt in our economy. After three and a half years of surging progress and prosperity, the optimism and confidence that have characterized our country since 1952 seemed to be wearing thin in spots.... Maybe things are as good as the statisticians say, or as terrible as the man on the radio charges. I don't doubt the sincerity or integrity of either of them. But obviously they can't both be right; and obviously, the voter will soon have to decide. And whatever his decision, my heart goes out to him in sympathy. For if he has not considered all the facts, he is not fit to make the decision; and if he has considered all of them, he probably is in no condition to make it. The only consolation he has is the certain knowledge that the man he votes for will be, by election day, in much worse shape than he is." -- Rep. Harold C. Ostertag (R N.Y.) Oct. 11 newsletter.

● **SMALL BUSINESS** -- "I have been alarmed for many months by the rapid decline of small business profits (down 51.6 percent in the three years).... I have been concerned, also, by the great increase in the rate of small business failures (1956 rate 40 percent above the average for the period from 1949 through 1952).... I am in agreement with many of the promises, politically inspired or not, being made by politicians of both parties these days. I merely suggest, however, that no matter who wins the election, the state of our economy depends upon many of those promises being kept...." -- Rep. Frank Thompson Jr. (D N.J.) Oct. 8 release.

● **AID TO EDUCATION** -- "If there have been any doubts that there is to be an intense renewal in the 85th Congress of the drive for federal aid to education, these doubts ought to be entirely dispelled by now.... Last week President Eisenhower announced his intention to press for federal assistance to the states.... Democratic Nominee Stevenson...declared in favor of 'commitment of federal funds to aid the states....' It is 'just a beginning' of permanent federal intrusion in a field heretofore reserved to the states and local school districts.... If I am returned to Congress, I intend to continue to work, speak and vote against this type of legislation." -- Rep. August E. Johansen (R Mich.) Oct. 10 release.

● **CONGRESSIONAL SEATS** -- "The job of apportioning the seats of Congress to give equal representation throughout the country is not an easy one. It will not be undertaken again until after the 1960 census.... After each census...Congress assigns the number of representatives to each state, and the states themselves decide how this number will be split up within the states. This sometimes leads to... 'gerrymandering', wherein the party in power in a state attempts to divide the Congressional districts in such a way as to favor its candidates. It is not easy to design the districts so that they are all of equal population, and many problems arise in reapportionment.... The number of representatives was frequently increased during the first hundred years of our history:... (it) has stood at 435 since 1913. It could be increased, but many persons believe it would be unwise to increase the number... for it is difficult to conduct business in too large a group." -- Rep. William G. Bray (R Ind.) Oct. 11 newsletter.



The Week In Congress

Committee Probes

Senate committees struck out in four different directions in politically flavored investigations. In Chicago, the Senate Banking and Currency Committee added its spotlight to those focused on the \$1.5 million embezzlement of state funds by Republican Orville E. Hodge, jailed Illinois state auditor. In Washington, other Democratic-dominated committees held hearings on alleged selling of Texas postmasterships, lobbying for the natural gas bill and campaign contributions to both parties. The lobby probe included testimony about pressure to defeat social security legislation. (Page 1219)

Senate Races

Republicans face a come-from-behind challenge to regain control of the Senate. As the 1956 campaign heads into the home stretch, Democrats have pulled slightly ahead. If -- and it's a big if -- they can make their lead stand up, they ought to hold, or even add slightly to their present 49-47 seat edge in the upper chamber. Democratic candidates have pulled ahead of their opponents in Arizona, Nevada, Pennsylvania and Washington. In Connecticut, Rep. Thomas J. Dodd (D) has evened the odds against Sen. Prescott Bush (R). And in normally Republican South Dakota, farmer Kenneth Holum (D) is giving favored Sen. Francis Case (R) more competition than was expected. In two states the chances for Republican victory seem brighter than they did in August. Results of Colorado's September primary mark ex-Gov. Dan Thornton (R) as a probable winner over the Democrats' ex-Rep. John A. Carroll, a two-time loser in Senate races. The Ohio Senate race between Sen. George H. Bender (R) and Gov. Frank J. Lausche (D) looks like a toss-up. Doubtful, too, are races in New York, Oregon, Maryland and the Kentucky battle between ex-Gov. Lawrence Wetherby (D) and ex-Sen. John Sherman Cooper (Page 1207)

Alaska Election

Democrats led on all fronts in the Oct. 9 Alaska election. Incomplete returns showed Democrats ahead in 30 of 39 territorial offices and in the race for Delegate to Congress. The Democratic candidates for U.S. "Senator" and "Representative" also held the edge over Republican opponents. Alaska hopes to speed its admission to the U.S. as a state by sending a Senator and Representative to Washington, even though it does not have specific authority to do so. In 1952, Alaskans elected Republicans to 21 of 24 territorial house seats and to six of nine senate seats. In 1954, 21 Democrats and three Republicans were elected to the house and nine Democrats and no Republicans to the senate. (Page 1223)

Rep. Priest Dies

Rep. J. Percy Priest (D Tenn.), who represented the state's Fifth District since 1941, died Oct. 12 in Nashville after undergoing an operation for ulcers.

A former writer for the Nashville Tennessean, Rep. Priest was elected to Congress Nov. 5, 1940. He was opposed for re-election in 1956 by George Spence of Nashville.

In the 84th Congress, Rep. Priest was Chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. He was 56.

Co-op Taxes

Should cooperatives be taxed exactly the same as corporations? The National Tax Equality Assn. and 11 other lobbies say yes while a group of cooperative organizations, spearheaded by the Cooperative League of the U.S.A., say no. Co-ops are not taxed on the money they pay back to customers while corporations are taxed on money they pay as dividends to shareholders. Say the co-ops: Why should we be taxed when we hand back our profits to the customers? They agree that the money should be taxed once it gets in the customers' hands. But the corporations say the tax differential gives co-ops an unfair competitive advantage over them. NTEA's lobby strategy combines the shotgun and rifle bullet approaches. The 12 lobbies will press Congress for co-op tax revision under their individual names and also will coordinate all the efforts through the newly created Trade Assns. Information Committee for the Taxation of Cooperatives. Co-chairmen of that overall Committee are Leonard J. Calhoun, general counsel for the Public Information Committee of the Cotton Industries, and Robert H. North, registered lobbyist for the International Assn. of Ice Cream Manufacturers. (Page 1213)